

The Extended Chiral Quark Model and QCD

A. A. Andrianov*, D. Espriu[†] and R. Tarrach[‡]

*Departament d'Estructura i Constituents de la Matèria
Universitat de Barcelona
Diagonal, 647, 08028 Barcelona, Spain*

ABSTRACT

We consider the low energy effective action of QCD below the chiral symmetry breaking scale, including, in Wilson's spirit, all operators of dimensionality less or equal to 6 which can be built with quark and chiral fields. The effect of the residual gluon interactions is contained in a number of coupling constants, whose running is studied. The resulting model is an extension of both the chiral quark model and the Nambu-Jona-Lasinio one. Constraints on the coefficients of the effective lagrangian are derived from the requirement of chiral symmetry restoration at energies above the chiral symmetry breaking scale, from matching to QCD at intermediate scales, and by fitting some hadronic observables. In this model two types of pseudoscalar states (massless pions and massive Π -mesons), as well as one scalar one arise as a consequence of dynamical chiral symmetry breaking. Their masses and coupling constants are studied. We also predict a number of low energy structural constants. We find out that QCD favours a low-energy effective theory which is largely dominated by the simplest chiral quark model, whereas higher dimensional operators (such as those of the Nambu-Jona-Lasinio type) can be assumed to be small.

PACS codes: 12.38.-t, 12.39.-x, 14.40.-n

Keywords: Quantum Chromodynamics, Chiral Quark Models, Mesons

UB-ECM-PF 98/04

February 1998

hep-ph/9803232

*Permanent address: Department of Theoretical Physics, Sankt-Petersburg State University, 198904 Sankt-Petersburg, Russia. E-mail: andrian@snoopy.phys.spbu.ru

[†] E-mail: espriu@ecm.ub.es

[‡] E-mail: tarrach@ecm.ub.es

1. Introduction

Two QCD-inspired quark models are commonly used¹ as substitutes of QCD in the hadronization regime[1-10].

The first one is the Chiral Quark Model (CQM) [1] with colored quark fields $q_i^\alpha, \bar{q}_i^\alpha; i = 1, \dots, N_c, \alpha = 1, 2, \dots, N_F$ interacting with the colorless chiral field $U(x)$, by means of the Yukawa-type operator

$$\mathcal{L}_{CQM} = \bar{q} \left(i \not{\partial} - M_0 (U P_L + U^\dagger P_R) \right) q + \frac{1}{4} f_0^2 \text{tr} \left(\partial_\mu U \partial^\mu U^\dagger \right), \quad (1)$$

where $\not{\partial} \equiv \gamma^\mu \partial_\mu$ and the projectors $P_{L(R)} = (1 \pm \gamma_5)/2$ are used. M_0 is a chirally invariant constituent mass, which is assumed to acquire a non-zero value once chiral symmetry is spontaneously broken. $U(x) = \exp(i\pi(x)/F_0)$ is a $SU(N_F)$ matrix with generators $\pi \equiv \pi^a T^a$, $a = 1, \dots, N_F^2 - 1$. This massless lagrangian (1) is invariant under $SU_L(N_F) \otimes SU_R(N_F)$ symmetry transformations of chiral and quark fields

$$U \rightarrow \Omega_R U \Omega_L^\dagger, \quad q_L \rightarrow \Omega_L q_L, \quad q_R \rightarrow \Omega_R q_R, \quad (2)$$

and hence the fields $\pi(x)$ correspond to the massless Goldstone bosons. For this paper we take $N_F = 2$.

The constant F_0 is the pion decay constant, whereas f_0 represents a bare (as opposed to radiatively induced) pion decay constant, which is supposed to contain residual gluon contributions not accounted for by the constituent mass. This bare f_0 is considerably enhanced by the radiative quark-loop contribution to a final value F_0 . Setting $f_0 = 0$ is equivalent to assuming that the main infrared effect of QCD—the dynamical breaking of chiral symmetry—is associated solely to the appearance of the constituent mass M_0 . On the other hand, in a more precise treatment low-energy gluons surely contribute in other ways and shift the free-quark loop value of the pion constant. This effect is encoded in the bare pion kinetic term[2].

The second approach is provided by the Nambu-Jona-Lasinio model (NJL)[4]. It contains a chirally invariant four-fermion interaction. For massless quarks it reads

$$\mathcal{L}_{NJL} = i \bar{q} \not{\partial} q + \frac{g}{4N_c \Lambda^2} \left[(\bar{q} q)^2 - (\bar{q} \gamma_5 \tau^a q)^2 \right]. \quad (3)$$

This lagrangian is also invariant under $SU_L(2) \otimes SU_R(2)$ symmetry transformations (2) of quark fields. It is however well known that for strong enough coupling $g > g_c$ dynamical breaking of chiral symmetry occurs in this model. This leads to the creation of a massless pion state, to the appearance of a dynamical quark mass M_d (similar to M_0), and to the presence of a massive scalar meson state with the mass $m_\sigma \simeq 2M_d$, the sigma particle.

Both models provide, after integrating out the fermions, basically the same set of low energy structural constants describing interactions between (pseudo) Goldstone bosons, in reasonable agreement with data, specially for those operators which are

¹A direct QCD bosonization approach also exists [11], which allows to construct light meson lagrangians at low energies.

quark mass independent. However, neither of these two models is really satisfactory at intermediate energies ~ 1 GeV. The CQM does not describe scalar, pseudoscalar, etc. meson states with masses ~ 1 GeV, which are certainly present in the phenomenology[12]. The NJL model (which can be extended to include vector and axial-vector fields, in addition to pions and scalars[5]) does not incorporate the heavy pseudoscalar Π either² with mass $m_\Pi \simeq 1.3$ GeV, thus treating this channel asymmetrically. Furthermore, its scalar sigma meson is too light to be identified with an observable scalar quarkonium state. Both these models fail to correctly reproduce the restoration of chiral symmetry at energies just above the chiral breaking scale. This restoration is characteristic of QCD even at relatively low energies thanks to the strong power suppression of the chirally non-invariant condensates. For instance, the first QCD contribution to the difference of scalar-pseudoscalar two-point correlators is of $\mathcal{O}(1/p^4)$ but even this one turns out to be negligible (see section 7).

Several ways have been proposed [2, 5, 6, 7] to modify the above models in order to bring them into better agreement with phenomenology and to conform to the predictions of QCD. The quasilocal approach of [6] (see also [7]) represents a generalization of the NJL model where four-fermion operators with derivatives are incorporated, motivated by the soft momentum expansion of the QCD effective action. For sufficiently strong couplings, the new operators promote the formation of additional scalar and pseudoscalar states. These models allow an extension of the linear σ model provided by the NJL model, with the pion being a broken symmetry partner of the lightest scalar meson just as before, and with excited pions and scalar particles coming in pairs.

Clearly, to deal with the problem of which is the relevant effective action of QCD at intermediate energies we have to think in more general terms and use only those constraints which can be derived from symmetry and QCD principles and renormalization-group ideas. We propose here a wilsonian approach. We shall consider the most general action describing strong interactions once the spontaneous breakdown of chiral symmetry has taken place at a scale Λ , without committing ourselves to any specific mechanism or model. This effective wilsonian action should clearly contain the new light degrees of freedom appearing below Λ , namely the (pseudo) Goldstone bosons. In this paper we thus adopt the point of view that the pion is a distinguished hadron state being the (pseudo) Goldstone particle associated to the breaking of chiral symmetry. Their couplings to fermions and to other mesons will therefore be the ones indicated by the non-linear sigma model. As, in the chiral limit, the pion is the only massless hadron state one can presume that, after its explicit incorporation in the low energy effective action, the remaining nonlocal operators are expandable in powers of momenta in all color-singlet (hadronic) channels. We thus include all possible local operators up to dimension six (the choice of this upper dimension will be argued latter) which can be built with the help of the chiral field U and quarks which are gauge and chiral invariant. Gluons themselves are not explicitly included. Rather the effect of low energy gluons is contained in a number of parameters, which will depend on quantities like $\langle \alpha_s GG \rangle$ and similar ones. These parameters cannot be determined at present and they will be taken as given

²This meson is often identified with the radial excitation of the pion and denoted as π' .

and used as boundary conditions (at scale Λ) of our renormalization-group equations. However, once properly normalized they are expected to be of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ on naturalness grounds, unless forbidden due to some QCD property (such as e.g. chiral symmetry).

Thus the effective lagrangian of strong interactions below the breaking scale will be taken to be

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & \bar{q} \left(i \not{\partial} - M_0 (U P_L + U^\dagger P_R) \right) q + \frac{1}{4} f_0^2 \text{tr} \left(\partial_\mu U \partial^\mu U^\dagger \right) \\ & + \Delta\mathcal{L}^{(4)} + \Delta\mathcal{L}^{(5)} + \Delta\mathcal{L}^{(6)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where we have made manifest the lowest dimensional operator induced by the breaking. It is the one considered in the CQM and we just remark here that is the one of lowest dimension and hence expected to be the most relevant one. The remaining operators have been classified according to their dimensionality and lumped into $\Delta\mathcal{L}^{(4)}$, $\Delta\mathcal{L}^{(5)}$, etc. One of these operators is the dimension 6 operator

$$\frac{g}{4N_c\Lambda^2} \left[(\bar{q}q)^2 - (\bar{q}\gamma_5\vec{\tau}q)^2 \right], \quad (5)$$

but of course there are many more. Their role will be discussed later. The scale normalizing the 4-fermion coupling constant is supposed to be related to the non-perturbative chiral symmetry breaking (CSB) scale ~ 1 GeV. Namely, we expect that attractive 4-quark forces are generated as a net effect of high-momentum gluon exchange with the natural infrared cutoff induced by the scale Λ . We have also explicitly included the color factor N_c to allow us to use the large number of colors limit. In addition we work in the leading log approximation. That is, we retain only those contributions which are universal and regulator independent (sometimes they can be constant when the logarithm is absent). Technically, this amounts to saying that our results are exact in the limit where there is a large separation between M_0 and the chiral symmetry breaking scale Λ . While this is of course not quite true in QCD, it is by no means a bad approximation and, in any case, the error made is of the same order as the contributions from operators which are beyond the precision of our model anyway.

Let us now advance some of our results. It will be proven that the mass spectrum of colorless states below Λ (in the large- N_c approach) includes two pseudoscalar states: the pion, massless in the chiral limit ($m_q = 0$), and a heavy Π -meson, and also one massive scalar state. In our model the Π -meson, rather than the pion, is the natural partner of the scalar meson. We have not done so explicitly, but the model can be easily extended to include the lightest vector and axial-vector QCD bound states. Keeping operators up to dimension six thus provides a ‘one massive resonance plus continuum’ model for the spectral functions in the large N_c limit. One could easily include excited states by considering higher dimensional operators, but at the price of pushing Λ away from the chiral symmetry breaking scale and making the meaning of the bare coefficients in the wilsonian action less transparent. We thus treat excited states as part of the continuum and integrate them out, as they are naturally heavier than the chiral symmetry breaking scale. (Of course in large N_c QCD we can adopt the opposite point of view, namely to dispose entirely of fermions and gluons and assume

that the value of the constants of the effective lagrangian at the chiral symmetry breaking scale Λ is provided by integrating the infinite tower of narrow resonances, or one may take a position somewhere in between.) Due to 4-quark forces the bare scalar decay constant verifies $F_\sigma > F_\pi$ and the linear σ -model equality is no more valid for it. However the residual chiral symmetry can be implemented in a way whose restoration at high energies is manifest. This residual invariance provides generalized σ model relations between decay coupling constants for three kinds of mesons. We will then see that phenomenology favors a weak coupling regime for the dynamics associated to four-quark operators. QCD seems to suggest that they play a marginal (albeit still phenomenologically important) role in CSB. We also derive the familiar chiral structural constants and touch upon basically all relevant parameters in low energy phenomenology.

The paper is structured as follows. In section 2 we formulate and motivate the selection rules which are applied to build the most general lagrangian. In section 3 we classify the operators assembled in $\Delta\mathcal{L}^{(i)}$ according to their role in the CSB, reduce their variety to a minimal set with the help of the selection rules and establish what we call the Extended Chiral Quark Model (ECQM). In section 4 we introduce in the ECQM the auxiliary scalar and pseudoscalar fields in order to describe dynamical effects in the large N_c approach. The mass-gap equation is derived and its solutions are analyzed in the weak and strong coupling regimes. In section 5 the mass-spectrum of scalar and pseudoscalar fields is obtained and the pion decay constant is determined in terms of the bare parameters of the model. In section 6 external vector, axial-vector, scalar and pseudoscalar sources are attached to the model. By these means the decay coupling constant of the pion is calculated and the current quark mass m_q is incorporated. The decay constant of the heavy Π is also estimated to first order in m_q . In section 7 a large N_c analysis of two-point correlators in QCD is performed and chiral symmetry restoration is analyzed on the basis of the operator product expansion (OPE) for high Euclidean momenta. The condition of chiral symmetry restoration leads to two sum rules à la Weinberg, but in the scalar channel. In section 8 the fitting of parameters of the ECQM is performed with the help of a number of observables and theoretical inputs. Finally section 9 contains our conclusions. Some technical details as well as some considerations which are not along the main line of the paper have been relegated to the appendices.

2. Selection rules

In this section we shall present the list of the rules allowing us to select the effective lagrangian operators and parameters of the Extended Chiral Quark Model. They are the following

1. Locality.
2. P and C invariance of the Lagrangian.
3. Chiral and gauge invariance.

4. Chiral Perturbation Theory (ChPT) counting rules for chiral fields at low energies, and the canonical dimension counting rules for quark fields valid for intermediate energies.
5. The incorporation of all operators of dimensionality smaller or equal to six, in order to take into consideration the qualitatively new dynamics originating from the local four-quark interactions.
6. The large N_c limit.
7. The assumption that residual gluon interactions below the chiral symmetry breaking (interactions whose strength must, logically, be much diminished, as the pion carries a substantial part of the strong force) can be included as bare coefficients of the effective lagrangian at scale Λ . These contributions will be deemed small at this scale and hence they will only be considered for the leading operators in the chiral lagrangian.
8. The subsequent neglect of bare operators of next-to-leading order in ChPT which contain four or more derivatives acting on mesons and no quark fields. We shall assume that the bulk of the contribution to these operators will be the one induced radiatively after integration of the fermions. (For explicit expressions of the bare coefficients of the Gasser-Leutwyler lagrangian in terms of the gluon condensate, both for the leading and next-to-leading terms, see [2].) In any case the eventual inclusion of non-zero bare values for the coefficients for the $\mathcal{O}(p^4)$ and $\mathcal{O}(p^6)$ chiral operators adds only to the value of the Gasser-Leutwyler coefficients and is of little consequence for the rest of the analysis.
9. The large cutoff approximation in the radiatively induced bosonic operators with the cutoff Λ being the scale of the chiral symmetry breaking. It will be applied in a strong sense as a large log approximation in the cutoff dependence which consistently supports the neglect of operators of dimension higher than 6 (see [6]).
10. The neglect of color singlet higher spin current-current interactions whose description requires explicit vector, axial-vector and higher-spin bosons. Likewise, we restrict ourselves to the study of isosinglet scalar and isotriplet pseudoscalar meson physics only. The extension to other fields is straightforward. This restriction does not affect the accuracy of the model other than by shifting the bare value of g_A .
11. The use of the equations of motion (EOM) of the CQM (with minimal number of derivatives) in order to replace derivatives in operators with the mass-like parameters and with higher-order multi-quark and multi-pion interactions.
12. The restoration of chiral symmetry at energies higher than Λ , that is, the fact that scalar current correlators should approach the pseudoscalar ones with relative asymptotics not worse than in QCD.

13. The normalization of the resulting pion decay constant F_π to the phenomenologically observed value and of the quark condensate to the typical theoretical input $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle = -(200 \div 250 \text{MeV})^3$.
14. The chiral dynamics relation

$$\Pi_S(0) - \bar{\Pi}_P^{aa}(0) = 64L_8 \frac{\langle \bar{q}q \rangle^2}{F_\pi^4}, \quad (6)$$

where $\bar{\Pi}_P^{aa}(0)$ stands for the zero-momentum value of the pseudoscalar two-point correlator with subtracted pion pole term projected onto the isospin singlet channel, and L_8 is a chiral constant of the Gasser-Leutwyler Lagrangian [13].

3. Complete set of operators of $d \leq 6$ in the ECQM

The complete set of chirally symmetric operators of dimension less or equal to six which in principle should be included in the effective Lagrangian can be divided into the following subsets: (a) purely chiral operators; (b),(c),(d),(e) operators bilinear in the fermion fields of $d = 3, 4, 5$ and 6 , respectively; (f) four-fermion interactions of $d = 6$. For the description of the above operators it is convenient to rewrite the derivative of the chiral field in terms of chiral currents

$$l_\mu \equiv U^\dagger \partial_\mu U, \quad r_\mu \equiv -(\partial_\mu U) U^\dagger. \quad (7)$$

(a) The purely chiral operators relevant for the description of low-energy pion dynamics include some with two chiral currents

$$\text{tr}(l_\mu l^\mu) = -\text{tr}(\partial_\mu U \partial^\mu U^\dagger), \quad (8)$$

$$\text{tr}(\partial_\mu l^\mu \partial_\nu l^\nu), \quad (9)$$

$$\text{tr}(\partial_\mu (\partial_\nu l^\nu) \partial^\mu (\partial_\sigma l^\sigma)). \quad (10)$$

Similar operators with $l_\mu \rightarrow r_\mu$ are in fact not independent. In addition we have operators with four or six chiral currents. (See [13] and [14] for a complete list.) They give next-to-leading contributions to strong interaction processes in the derivative expansion, namely their contribution contains at least four powers of external momenta. As discussed in section 2, we shall neglect these operators assuming that at the scale of chiral symmetry breaking Λ the corresponding bare coefficients are small. The operators are written in a form which is specially convenient in order to use the EOM for the chiral field. These we derive, as usual, from the lowest dimensional effective lagrangian, namely the CQM in (1), and they read

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_\mu l^\mu)_{ij} &= \frac{2M_0}{f_0^2} \left[(\bar{q}_R U)_i q_{Lj} - \bar{q}_{Lj} (U^\dagger q_R)_i - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ij} (\bar{q}_R U q_L - \bar{q}_L U^\dagger q_R) \right] \\ &= \frac{M_0}{f_0^2} (\vec{\tau})_{ij} \left[\bar{q}_R U \vec{\tau} q_L - \bar{q}_L \vec{\tau} U^\dagger q_R \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

A similar equation³ can be obtained for the right current r_μ with the replacement $U \rightarrow U^\dagger$; $l_\mu \rightarrow r_\mu$; $L \leftrightarrow R$. Eqs. (11) allow us to replace operators (9), (10) by four-fermion ones.

(b) This class is particularly simple. There is only one operator of $d = 3$ and it is a chirality flipping one

$$\bar{q}_R U q_L + \text{h.c.} \quad (12)$$

(c) The operators of $d = 4$ are chirality preserving

$$\bar{q}_L \not{\partial} q_L + \bar{q}_R \not{\partial} q_R, \quad (13)$$

$$\bar{q}_L \not{L} q_L + \bar{q}_R \not{R} q_R. \quad (14)$$

The latter operator contributes to the g_A constant of the (constituent) quark [1].

(d) The complete set of $d = 5$ operators, which are chirality flipping, can be built from operators with a ‘normally ordered’ differential structure (i.e. all the derivatives either act on chiral fields or to the right, on quark fields q_L, q_R). In particular, the full list of these reads⁴

$$\bar{q}_R U \partial^2 q_L + \text{h.c.}, \quad (15)$$

$$\bar{q}_R U (\partial_\mu l^\mu) q_L + \text{h.c.}, \quad (16)$$

$$\bar{q}_R U l^\mu \partial_\mu q_L + \text{h.c.}, \quad (17)$$

$$\bar{q}_R U l_\mu l^\mu q_L + \text{h.c.}, \quad (18)$$

$$\bar{q}_R U \sigma^{\mu\nu} l_\mu \partial_\nu q_L + \text{h.c.}, \quad (19)$$

$$\bar{q}_R U \sigma^{\mu\nu} [l_\mu, l_\nu] q_L + \text{h.c.}, \quad (20)$$

$$\bar{q}_R U \sigma^{\mu\nu} (\partial_\mu l_\nu) q_L + \text{h.c.}, \quad (21)$$

where $\sigma^{\mu\nu} \equiv [\gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu]$. These seven operators are not independent however. Namely, the identity

$$\partial_\mu l_\nu - \partial_\nu l_\mu + [l_\mu, l_\nu] = 0 \quad (22)$$

allows to replace (21) in favour of (20) and one is left with 6 independent operators. A further reduction is provided by applying the EOM, which we again borrow from the lowest dimensional CQM (1)

$$i \not{\partial} q_L = M_0 U^+ q_R, \quad i \not{\partial} q_R = M_0 U q_L. \quad (23)$$

See the appendix A for a justification of our usage of the EOM.

In order to use the simplification brought about by the EOM most effectively it is convenient to rewrite all the operators in such a way that the Dirac derivative acts either on the left or on the right side. Two independent differential identities are useful for this purpose

$$U \not{L} \not{\partial} = U l^\mu (\partial_\mu + \frac{1}{2} U \sigma^{\mu\nu} l_\mu \partial_\nu), \quad (24)$$

$$\not{\partial} U \not{L} + U \not{L} \not{\partial} = 2U l^\mu \partial_\mu + U (\partial_\mu l^\mu) + U l_\mu l^\mu. \quad (25)$$

³The last term in the first line of (11) appears for $SU(2)$ chiral fields and is absent for $U(2)$ fields.

⁴In h.c. terms $U^\dagger$ and right chiral currents r_μ appear in a mirror reflected way. Therefore all the analysis done with left currents is valid also for the h.c. terms.

Then any two of the operators (17), (18), (19) can be replaced with a combination of the third one and the operators

$$\bar{q}_R U \not{I} (\not{\partial} q_L) + \text{h.c.}, \quad (26)$$

$$\bar{q}_R \not{\partial} (U \not{I} q_L) + \text{h.c.}, \quad (27)$$

which in turn can be related to already considered lower dimensional operators after application of the EOM. Similarly, the first two operators (15), (16) can be subject to EOM reduction with the help of (11),(23). Finally we end up with only two relevant operators of $d = 5$. Let us take the operators (18) and (20) as the basic ones.

Finally, we analyze the structure of (20) and discover that at low energies, when $l_\mu \simeq i\partial_\mu \pi^a \tau^a$, this operator becomes

$$\bar{q}_R U \sigma^{\mu\nu} [l_\mu, l_\nu] q_L + \text{h.c.} \simeq -2i\epsilon^{abc} \partial_\mu \pi^a \partial_\nu \pi^b \bar{q}_R \sigma^{\mu\nu} \tau^c q_L + \text{h.c.} \quad (28)$$

The quark bilinear in the above equation, being proportional to the antisymmetric tensor current, will be interpolated after bosonization by derivatives acting on bosonic fields: $\epsilon^{abc} \partial_\mu \Phi^a \partial_\nu \Phi^b$. It will involve either two pseudoscalar fields or two scalar ones as we do not consider any vector or tensor fields in this paper. Therefore after integration of the fermion fields, only terms with four or more derivatives acting on scalar fields will be produced by this operator. Thus (20) is on the same footing as the next-to-leading set of operators containing at least four derivatives of bosonic fields, whose bare coefficients we agreed not to consider. In fact, on dimensional grounds based on our selection rules, the present contribution will be suppressed with respect to the purely bare value of the $\mathcal{O}(p^4)$ operators by powers of M_0/Λ and therefore is subleading even with respect to the bare value of the $\mathcal{O}(p^4)$ coefficients, which we anyway neglect.

With these arguments only one operator, say (18), should be taken into account in the ECQM.

(e) We move next to the $d = 6$ operators which can be built out of a quark bilinear by adding derivatives and chiral currents. This category consists of 25 (chirality preserving) operators with three derivatives, of course not all of them independent

$$\bar{q}_L \hat{\mathcal{O}}_3^L q_L + \bar{q}_R \hat{\mathcal{O}}_3^R q_R, \quad (29)$$

where the ‘normal ordered’ differential operator $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_3^L$ can be any from the following list ⁵

$$\not{\partial} \partial^2, \quad (30)$$

$$\not{I} \partial^2, \quad \partial^2 \not{I}, \quad (\partial_\mu l^\mu) \not{\partial}, \quad l^\mu \partial_\mu \not{\partial}, \quad (31)$$

$$\not{\partial} (l_\mu) \partial^\mu, \quad (\partial_\mu \not{I}) \partial^\mu, \quad \not{\partial} (\partial_\mu l^\mu) \quad \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda} \gamma_5 \gamma^\mu (\partial^\nu l^\rho) \partial^\lambda, \quad (32)$$

$$l_\mu l^\mu \not{\partial}, \quad \not{\partial} (l_\mu) l^\mu, \quad l^\mu \not{\partial} (l_\mu), \quad l^\mu (\partial_\mu \not{I}), \quad (\partial_\mu \not{I}) l^\mu, \quad (33)$$

$$\not{I} (\partial_\mu l^\mu), \quad (\partial_\mu l^\mu) \not{I}, \quad l_\mu \not{I} \partial^\mu, \quad \not{I} l_\mu \partial^\mu, \quad \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda} \gamma_5 \gamma^\mu l^\nu l^\rho \partial^\lambda, \quad (34)$$

$$\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda} \gamma_5 \gamma^\mu (\partial^\nu l^\rho) l^\lambda, \quad \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda} \gamma_5 \gamma^\mu l^\nu (\partial^\rho l^\lambda), \quad (35)$$

$$\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda} \gamma_5 \gamma^\mu l^\nu l^\rho l^\lambda, \quad \not{I} l_\mu l^\mu, \quad l_\mu \not{I} l^\mu, \quad l_\mu l^\mu \not{I}. \quad (36)$$

⁵The operators $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_3^R$ are obtained from $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_3^L$ by replacement $l_\mu \longrightarrow r_\mu$.

We use the conventions $\gamma_5 = i\gamma_0\gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3$ and $\epsilon_{0123} = 1$. Not all of them are independent, of course. We have the following seven identities

$$\partial^2(\mathcal{I}) = \not{\partial}(\partial_\mu l^\mu) + [\mathcal{I}, (\partial_\mu l^\mu)] - [l^\mu, (\partial_\mu \mathcal{I})], \quad (37)$$

$$(\partial_\mu \mathcal{I})\partial^\mu = [\not{\partial}, l_\mu \partial^\mu] - [l_\mu, \mathcal{I}]\partial^\mu, \quad (38)$$

$$\{l^\mu, (\partial_\mu \mathcal{I})\} = [\not{\partial}, l_\mu l^\mu] + \{l^\mu, [\mathcal{I}, l_\mu]\}, \quad (39)$$

$$[l^\mu, \not{\partial}(l_\mu)] = [l^\mu, (\partial_\mu \mathcal{I})] - [l^\mu, [l_\mu, \mathcal{I}]], \quad (40)$$

$$\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}\gamma_5\gamma^\mu(\partial^\nu l^\rho)\partial^\lambda = -\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}\gamma_5\gamma^\mu l^\nu l^\rho \partial^\lambda, \quad (41)$$

$$\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}\gamma_5\gamma^\mu(\partial^\nu l^\rho)l^\lambda = -\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}\gamma_5\gamma^\mu l^\nu l^\rho l^\lambda = \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}\gamma_5\gamma^\mu l^\nu(\partial^\rho l^\lambda) \quad (42)$$

and one is left with 18 independent operators in (29).

Of these, ten operators are subject to obvious reduction with the help of the EOM. They are the ones containing

$$\not{\partial}\partial^2, \quad \mathcal{I}\partial^2, \quad (\partial_\mu l^\mu)\not{\partial}, \quad l^\mu\partial_\mu\not{\partial}, \quad l_\mu l^\mu\not{\partial}, \quad (43)$$

$$[\not{\partial}, l_\mu\partial^\mu] = \not{\partial}(l_\mu)\partial^\mu, \quad [\not{\partial}, l_\mu l^\mu] = \{\not{\partial}(l_\mu), l^\mu\}, \quad (44)$$

$$[\not{\partial}, (\partial_\mu l^\mu)], \quad \mathcal{I}(\partial_\mu l^\mu), \quad (\partial_\mu l^\mu)\mathcal{I}. \quad (45)$$

Evidently the related 10 operators in (29) are eliminated straightforwardly. Of the remaining ones, three operators, namely

$$[l^\mu, (\partial_\mu \mathcal{I})], \quad [l_\mu, \mathcal{I}]\partial^\mu, \quad (46)$$

$$\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}\gamma_5\gamma^\mu l^\nu l^\rho \partial^\lambda, \quad (47)$$

are involved in the following two identities

$$2[l_\mu, \mathcal{I}]\partial^\mu + [l^\mu, (\partial_\mu \mathcal{I})] = [\mathcal{I}, \partial^2] + [\not{\partial}, (\partial_\mu l^\mu)] + 2[\not{\partial}, l_\mu \partial^\mu] + [\mathcal{I}, (\partial_\mu l^\mu)], \quad (48)$$

$$i\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}\gamma_5\gamma^\mu l^\nu l^\rho \partial^\lambda - [l_\mu, \mathcal{I}]\partial^\mu = \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{\mu\nu}l^\mu l^\nu \not{\partial}, \quad (49)$$

and, therefore, by using the EOM one can discard the operators (46) in favour of (47).

Finally, one is left with the following 6 operators:

$$\{\mathcal{I}, l_\mu\}\partial^\mu - \frac{1}{2}l_\mu l^\mu \not{\partial}, \quad (50)$$

$$\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}\gamma_5\gamma^\mu l^\nu l^\rho \partial^\lambda, \quad \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}\gamma_5\gamma^\mu l^\nu l^\rho l^\lambda, \quad \mathcal{I}l_\mu l^\mu, \quad l_\mu \mathcal{I}l^\mu, \quad l_\mu l^\mu \mathcal{I}. \quad (51)$$

Notice that one of the operators contains a piece which is manifestly reducible by the use of the EOM. We have kept it to make the associated quark bilinear traceless. Note also that the analysis of the structure of other possible EOM-reducible operators with a different position of the Dirac derivative $\not{\partial}$ does not yield any new constraints.

We notice that the above structures contain at least two chiral currents. Let us consider, for instance, the quark bilinear containing an insertion of the first of the above structures. Since $l_\mu \simeq i\partial_\mu \pi^a \tau^a$,

$$\bar{q}_L \{\mathcal{I}, l_\mu\} \partial^\mu q_L \simeq \left(-2\partial_\mu \pi^a \partial_\nu \pi^a + \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu} \partial_\rho \pi^a \partial^\rho \pi^a \right) \bar{q}_L \gamma^\mu \partial^\nu q_L. \quad (52)$$

Since we neglect tensor fields, at low energies the fermion bilinear $\bar{q}_L \gamma^\mu \partial^\nu q_L$ must be bosonized as

$$\begin{aligned} & A \left(\partial^\mu \partial^\nu - \frac{1}{4} g^{\mu\nu} \partial^2 \right) S + B \left(\partial^\mu P \partial^\nu P - \frac{1}{4} g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\rho P \partial^\rho P \right) \\ & + C \left(\partial^\mu S \partial^\nu S - \frac{1}{4} g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\rho S \partial^\rho S \right) \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

where S, P stand here for generic scalar and pseudoscalar fields and A, B, C are bosonization constants. As a result all fermion bilinear $d = 6$ operators lead, after integration of the fermion fields, to $\mathcal{O}(p^4)$ terms in the low energy effective chiral lagrangian, which, just as before, we need not consider as they are suppressed by a factor of $\mathcal{O}(M_0/\Lambda)$ with respect to the bare $\mathcal{O}(p^4)$ terms which we have already neglected. Therefore there are no operators of type (e) which are eligible to be included in the leading wilsonian action.

Insofar the effective operators considered are leading in the large N_c expansion. To complete the list of chirally invariant operators bilinear in quark fields one should mention also those ones built of two disconnected traces in isospin indices and according to the QCD-motivated combinatorial estimations [15] they may arise in the next-to-leading large- N_c order as a result of chiral bosonization involving two quark loops. For $SU(N)$ chiral fields⁶ these operators are

$$\bar{q}_R U q_L \text{tr} (l_\mu l^\mu) + \text{h.c.}, \quad (54)$$

$$\bar{q}_L \gamma_\mu \partial_\nu q_L \text{tr} (l^\mu l^\nu) - \frac{1}{4} \bar{q}_L \not{\partial} q_L \text{tr} (l_\mu l^\mu) + (L, l_\mu \rightarrow R, r_\mu), \quad (55)$$

$$\bar{q}_L \gamma_\mu l^\mu q_L \text{tr} (l_\nu l^\nu) - (L, l_\mu \rightarrow R, r_\mu), \quad (56)$$

$$\bar{q}_L \gamma_\mu l_\nu q_L \text{tr} (l^\mu l^\nu) - (L, l_\mu \rightarrow R, r_\mu), \quad (57)$$

$$\bar{q}_L \gamma_\mu q_L \text{tr} (l^\mu l_\nu l^\nu) - (L, l_\mu \rightarrow R, r_\mu), \quad (58)$$

$$\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda} \bar{q}_L \gamma^\mu q_L \text{tr} (l^\nu l^\rho l^\lambda) - (L, l_\mu \rightarrow R, r_\mu) \quad (59)$$

$$= -\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda} \bar{q}_L \gamma^\mu q_L \text{tr} ((\partial^\nu l^\rho) l^\lambda) - (L, l_\mu \rightarrow R, r_\mu), \quad (60)$$

$$\bar{q}_L \not{\partial} q_L \text{tr} (l_\mu l^\mu) + (L, l_\mu \rightarrow R, r_\mu), \quad (61)$$

$$\bar{q}_L \gamma^\mu q_L \text{tr} (l_\mu (\partial_\nu l^\nu)) + (L, l_\mu \rightarrow R, r_\mu), \quad (62)$$

$$\bar{q}_L \gamma^\mu q_L \text{tr} (l^\nu (\partial_\nu l_\mu)) + (L, l_\mu \rightarrow R, r_\mu) \quad (63)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = \bar{q}_L \gamma^\mu q_L \text{tr} (l_\nu (\partial_\mu l^\nu)) + (L, l_\mu \rightarrow R, r_\mu) \\ & = -\frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu (\bar{q}_L \gamma^\mu q_L) \text{tr} (l_\nu l^\nu) + (L, l_\mu \rightarrow R, r_\mu). \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

The operator (60) is reducible due to (22). Three operators (61), (62), (63), (64) can be eliminated by means of the EOM. The operator (58) vanishes in the $SU(2)$ case but may contribute for any chiral symmetry group with nontrivial symmetric structure constants, in particular, for $U(2)$ and $SU(3)$ chiral groups. An analysis

⁶If the $U_A(1)$ extension of the ECQM were considered one would have to add 32 more independent operators. However in this paper we adopt the viewpoint that the $U(1)$ pseudoscalar boson is not chiral as it remains massive in the chiral limit. Therefore it should arise from an effective quark selfinteraction.

similar to the one already performed leads to the conclusion that all the operators (55) – (59) contain at least four powers of momenta (four derivatives) and should, to be consistent with our selection rules, be neglected. Thus only one operator, (54), should be included in the leading-order lagrangian. But for the $SU(2)$ case it coincides with (18) and does not introduce any new phenomenological constant.

(f) We finally turn to $d = 6$ four-fermion operators. Amongst them, according to our selection rules, we retain only those built from color singlet scalar and pseudoscalar quark densities supplemented with chiral fields. We shall choose a basis for these operators consisting in bilinears with a definite isospin in the color-singlet channel

$$\Phi_1 = \bar{q}_L U^\dagger q_R \bar{q}_R U q_L, \quad (65)$$

$$\Phi_2 = \bar{q}_L \tau^a U^\dagger q_R \bar{q}_R U \tau^a q_L, \quad (66)$$

$$\Phi_3 = \bar{q}_L U^\dagger q_R \bar{q}_L U^\dagger q_R + \bar{q}_R U q_L \bar{q}_R U q_L, \quad (67)$$

$$\Phi_4 = \bar{q}_L \tau^a U^\dagger q_R \bar{q}_L \tau^a U^\dagger q_R + \bar{q}_R U \tau^a q_L \bar{q}_R U \tau^a q_L. \quad (68)$$

where color indices are contracted within each quark bilinear.

Depending on the choice of the chiral group, there are a few invariant combinations which do not depend manifestly on chiral fields. In the particular case of $SU(2)$ there are two invariants

$$(\bar{q}q)^2 - (\bar{q}\gamma_5 \vec{\tau}q)^2 = 2\Phi_1 + 2\Phi_2 + \Phi_3 - \Phi_4; \quad (69)$$

$$(\bar{q}\gamma_5 q)^2 - (\bar{q}\vec{\tau}q)^2 = -2\Phi_1 - 2\Phi_2 + \Phi_3 - \Phi_4, \quad (70)$$

while in general only their difference is invariant and U -independent

$$2\bar{q}_L^i q_R^j \bar{q}_R^j q_L^i = \Phi_1 + \Phi_2. \quad (71)$$

As discussed in section 2, for simplicity we shall only consider the isosinglet scalar and isovector pseudoscalar channels. (The generalization to other channels is straightforward and it does not modify in any essential way the results presented in the coming sections.) Then, of all the four fermion operators in (65) - (68), we need to take into consideration the following combinations

$$\Phi_{S0} = (\bar{q}_L U^\dagger q_R + \bar{q}_R U q_L)^2 = 2\Phi_1 + \Phi_3, \quad (72)$$

$$\Phi_{P1} = (-\bar{q}_L \vec{\tau} U^\dagger q_R + \bar{q}_R U \vec{\tau} q_L)^2 = \Phi_4 - 2\Phi_2. \quad (73)$$

There are theoretical arguments (see appendix B) suggesting that the coefficients of these operators, g_{S0} and g_{P1} , must be identical at the chiral symmetry breaking scale Λ . However these operators may acquire different coupling constants below the chiral symmetry breaking scale due to the use of the EOM on other operators of $d \leq 6$. Indeed, the reduction of the dim-6 operator (9) and of the dim-5 operator (16) with the help of the EOM (11) yields a contribution into the operator (73) changing the value of g_{P1} . Thus, even if the constants g_{S0} and g_{P1} are initially saturated by equal high energy gluon exchange (as chiral symmetry holds in QCD perturbation theory) they are split after the EOM are applied. We shall keep them as independent coupling constants.

4. Minimal ECQM and mass-gap equation

We shall from now on work in euclidean space-time, making the appropriate Wick rotation back to Minkowski space when required, and regularize the effective action obtained after integration of the fermions by using a manifestly chiral invariant cutoff. Let us now put together all the operators which have survived the previous analysis. In the chiral limit we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{ECQM} = & i\bar{q} \left(\not{D}_A + M_0(U P_L + U^\dagger P_R) \right) q - \frac{f_0^2}{4} \text{tr}(l_\mu l_\mu) \\ & + \frac{g_{S0}}{4N_c \Lambda^2} (\bar{q}_L U^\dagger q_R + \bar{q}_R U q_L)^2 - \frac{g_{P1}}{4N_c \Lambda^2} (-\bar{q}_L \vec{\tau} U^\dagger q_R + \bar{q}_R U \vec{\tau} q_L)^2 \\ & + i \frac{\delta f_0}{\Lambda^2} [\bar{q}_R U l_\mu l_\mu q_L + \bar{q}_L U^\dagger r_\mu r_\mu q_R],\end{aligned}\quad (74)$$

where

$$\not{D}_A \equiv \not{D} + \frac{1}{2} \delta g_A (\not{L} P_L + \not{r} P_R). \quad (75)$$

As just discussed, g_{S0} and g_{P1} need not be equal. The reason to call the coupling constant in the last operator δf_0 is that it leads, after integration of the fermions, to a redefinition of f_0 . This operator is thus inessential in the analysis of two point correlators in the chiral limit and becomes significant only by providing a contribution of $\mathcal{O}(p^4)$ and beyond. This contribution is suppressed by a power of M_0^2/Λ^2 with respect to the bare value, which we consistently neglect anyway. Away from the chiral limit δf_0 should be kept, however, as we will discuss in section 6. At this point we notice something remarkable. If we ignore all bare $\mathcal{O}(p^4)$ contributions to the low energy effective action, the most general low energy action looks like a hybrid between the Chiral Quark and the Nambu-Jona-Lasinio models. However, as soon as we are interested in contributions of higher order in the momentum expansion, a number (not too large, fortunately) of bare couplings do contribute, modifying the dominant contribution from the fermion loop.

In order to simplify further the calculations it is helpful to introduce the fields

$$Q_L \equiv \xi q_L, \quad Q_R \equiv \xi^\dagger q_R, \quad \xi^2 \equiv U, \quad (76)$$

Under chiral transformations

$$\xi \longrightarrow h_\xi \xi \Omega_L^\dagger = \Omega_R \xi h_\xi^\dagger. \quad (77)$$

In these variables the ECQM action reads

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{ECQM} = & i\bar{Q} (\not{D} + M_0) Q - \frac{f_0^2}{4} \text{tr}(a_\mu a_\mu) \\ & + \frac{g_{S0}}{4N_c \Lambda^2} (\bar{Q}_L Q_R + \bar{Q}_R Q_L)^2 - \frac{g_{P1}}{4N_c \Lambda^2} (-\bar{Q}_L \vec{\tau} Q_R + \bar{Q}_R \vec{\tau} Q_L)^2 \\ & + i \frac{\delta f_0}{\Lambda^2} \bar{Q} a_\mu a_\mu Q,\end{aligned}\quad (78)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Q &\equiv Q_L + Q_R, \\ \not{D} &\equiv \not{\partial} + \frac{1}{2} \not{\gamma} + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_5 g_A \not{A}, \quad g_A \equiv 1 - \delta g_A, \\ v_\mu &\equiv \xi^\dagger (\partial_\mu \xi) - (\partial_\mu \xi) \xi^\dagger, \quad a_\mu \equiv \xi^\dagger (\partial_\mu \xi) + (\partial_\mu \xi) \xi^\dagger. \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

Let us now introduce auxiliary scalar, $\tilde{\Sigma}$, and pseudoscalar, $\tilde{\Pi} = \tilde{\Pi}^a \tau^a$, fields in order to make the lagrangian (74) bilinear in fermion variables. We can then replace

$$\frac{g_{S0}}{4N_c\Lambda^2} (\bar{Q}_L Q_R + \bar{Q}_R Q_L)^2 - \frac{g_{P1}}{4N_c\Lambda^2} (-\bar{Q}_L \vec{\tau} Q_R + \bar{Q}_R \vec{\tau} Q_L)^2 \quad (80)$$

by

$$i\bar{Q}_R(\tilde{\Sigma}(x) + i\tilde{\Pi}(x))Q_L + i\bar{Q}_L(\tilde{\Sigma}(x) - i\tilde{\Pi}(x))Q_R + N_c\Lambda^2 \left(\frac{\tilde{\Sigma}(x)^2}{g_{S0}} + \frac{(\tilde{\Pi}^a(x))^2}{g_{P1}} \right) \quad (81)$$

and an integration over the auxiliary variables. The tildes on the fields $\tilde{\Sigma}$ and $\tilde{\Pi}$ remind us that they are for the time being just auxiliary variables. The shift

$$\tilde{\Sigma} + i\tilde{\Pi} = H(x) - M_0 - \frac{\delta f_0}{\Lambda^2} a_\mu a_\mu, \quad H(x) \equiv \Sigma + i\tilde{\Pi}, \quad (82)$$

further simplifies the dependence on chiral fields and eventually one comes to the following lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{ECQM} &= i\bar{Q} \left(\not{D} + H(x)P_L + H^\dagger(x)P_R \right) Q + \mathcal{L}_{bos}, \\ \mathcal{L}_{bos} &\equiv \frac{N_c\Lambda^2}{8} \text{tr} \left(\widehat{H}(x)^T \widehat{g}^{-1} \widehat{H}(x) \right) - \frac{f_0^2}{4} \text{tr} (a_\mu a^\mu), \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{H}(x) &\equiv \begin{pmatrix} H(x) - M_0 - \frac{\delta f_0}{\Lambda^2} a_\mu a_\mu & \\ & H^\dagger(x) - M_0 - \frac{\delta f_0}{\Lambda^2} a_\mu a_\mu \end{pmatrix} \\ \widehat{g}^{-1} &\equiv \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{g_-} & \frac{1}{g_+} \\ \frac{1}{g_+} & \frac{1}{g_-} \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

with

$$\frac{1}{g_-} \equiv \frac{1}{g_{S0}} - \frac{1}{g_{P1}}, \quad \frac{1}{g_+} \equiv \frac{1}{g_{S0}} + \frac{1}{g_{P1}}. \quad (85)$$

After integrating over fermion fields one arrives to the following effective action for the colorless bosonic variables $\xi, \Sigma, \tilde{\Pi}$,

$$\mathcal{W} = \int d^4x \mathcal{L}_{bos} - N_c \text{Tr} \log \left(\frac{\not{D} + H(x)P_L + H^\dagger(x)P_R}{\mu} \right)_\Lambda. \quad (86)$$

Here the Tr operation stands for the total trace in coordinates and matrix indices. Notice that since f_0^2 is known to be proportional to N_c , the whole effective action is proportional to N_c . In the large N_c limit the corresponding functional integral will be saturated by its extrema.

Our starting wilsonian action had all modes above the chiral symmetry breaking scale Λ integrated out. The information about higher frequencies was contained in the coefficients of the intervening local operators. Obviously, to avoid double counting, we must now integrate the modes of the fermions only up to the scale Λ . This is denoted by the subindex Λ in the trace in (86). We shall in a few lines discuss how we do so. Notice also that Λ is also the dimensional parameter normalizing higher dimensional operators in the ECQM action (74). The scale μ is an arbitrary normalization scale for quantum contributions to the fermion free energy and is also an essential ingredient in the preparation of the low energy effective action (see below).

The Dirac operator appearing in (86), whose determinant we must compute, is of the form

$$\hat{D} \equiv i(\not{\partial} + \not{V} - \gamma_5 \not{A}) + i(S + i\gamma_5 P). \quad (87)$$

Given that we do not consider here anomalous, parity odd processes involving pseudoscalar fields, we only need the real part of the determinant, which is just the square root of the determinant of the positive operator

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{D}\hat{D}^\dagger &= -\not{D}_V^2 + \gamma_5\{\not{D}_V, \not{A}\} + S^2 + P^2 - i\gamma_5[S, P] \\ &\quad + \not{D}_V S - i\{A, P\} - \gamma_5\{A, S\} + i\gamma_5[\not{D}_V, P]. \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

where $\not{D}_V \equiv \not{\partial} + \not{V}$. We can now define our regulator

$$\text{ReTr} \log \left(\frac{\hat{D}}{\mu} \right)_\Lambda \equiv \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left(\Theta \left(\Lambda^2 - \hat{D}\hat{D}^\dagger \right) \log \left(\frac{\hat{D}\hat{D}^\dagger}{\mu^2} \right) \right), \quad (89)$$

where $\Theta(x)$ is the step-function.

Note that the cyclic property of the trace operation allows us to prove the invariance of (89) under local chiral transformations of quark fields and/or external sources

$$\hat{D}(V, A, S, P) = \Omega \hat{D}(V^\Omega, A^\Omega, S^\Omega, P^\Omega) \bar{\Omega}^\dagger, \quad (90)$$

$$\text{Tr} \log \left(\frac{\Omega \hat{D}\hat{D}^\dagger(V^\Omega, A^\Omega, S^\Omega, P^\Omega) \Omega^\dagger}{\mu^2} \right)_\Lambda = \text{Tr} \log \left(\frac{\hat{D}\hat{D}^\dagger(V^\Omega, A^\Omega, S^\Omega, P^\Omega)}{\mu^2} \right)_\Lambda \quad (91)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega &= P_L \Omega_L + P_R \Omega_R \quad \bar{\Omega} = P_L \Omega_R + P_R \Omega_L, \\ L_\mu^\Omega &\equiv V_\mu^\Omega + A_\mu^\Omega = \Omega_L^\dagger (V_\mu + A_\mu) \Omega_L + \Omega_L^\dagger \partial_\mu \Omega_L, \\ R_\mu^\Omega &\equiv V_\mu^\Omega - A_\mu^\Omega = \Omega_R^\dagger (V_\mu - A_\mu) \Omega_R + \Omega_R^\dagger \partial_\mu \Omega_R, \\ S^\Omega + iP^\Omega &= \Omega_R^\dagger (S + iP) \Omega_L, \\ S^\Omega - iP^\Omega &= \Omega_L^\dagger (S - iP) \Omega_R. \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

Note that $\Omega\bar{\Omega}^\dagger \neq 1$. In particular, one can choose the transformation (76) with $\Omega_R = \xi$, $\Omega_L = \xi^\dagger$ and then the Dirac operator in (83) is reproduced when substituting in (87)

$$V_\mu = \frac{1}{2}v_\mu, \quad A_\mu = -\frac{1}{2}g_A a_\mu, \quad S + iP = H = \Sigma + i\tilde{\Pi}. \quad (93)$$

The determinant of $\hat{D}$ will be expanded in inverse powers of the physical scale Λ . In addition to Λ we have two more scales, namely the subtraction scale μ and, since chiral symmetry is broken, we also expect $\langle S \rangle = \langle H \rangle \neq 0$. The scale μ can appear only within logarithms and is normalized either by the scale $\langle S \rangle$ acting as an infrared cut-off, or by the scale Λ acting as an ultraviolet cut-off. Within each order in the expansion in inverse powers of Λ we in turn expand in inverse powers of $\langle S \rangle$. It can be shown⁷ that for $\Lambda \gg \langle S \rangle$ and for $\mu \gg \langle S \rangle$ the leading contribution of this expansion is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \int d^4x \mathcal{L}_{1-loop} &\equiv -\frac{1}{2}\text{Tr} \left(\Theta \left(\Lambda^2 - \hat{D}\hat{D}^\dagger \right) \log \left(\frac{\hat{D}\hat{D}^\dagger}{\mu^2} \right) \right) \simeq \\ &\frac{N_c}{16\pi^2} \int d^4x \left\{ 2\Lambda^4 \left(\ln \frac{\mu^2}{\Lambda^2} + \frac{1}{2} \right) - 2\Lambda^2 \left(\ln \frac{\mu^2}{\Lambda^2} + 1 \right) \text{tr} (S^2 + P^2) \right. \\ &+ \ln \frac{\mu^2}{\langle S \rangle^2} \text{tr} \left((S^2 + P^2)^2 - [S, P]^2 \right. \\ &+ [D_\mu^V, S]^2 + [D_\mu^V, P]^2 - \{A_\mu, S\}^2 - \{A_\mu, P\}^2 \\ &- 2i[D_\mu^V, P]\{A_\mu, S\} + 2i[D_\mu^V, S]\{A_\mu, P\} \\ &\left. \left. - \frac{1}{3} \left((F_{\mu\nu}^L)^2 + (F_{\mu\nu}^R)^2 \right) \right) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

where we have kept, of all terms of $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda^0)$, only those which are logarithmically enhanced. We thus neglect terms of $\mathcal{O}(p^4)$ which are not logarithmically enhanced and terms of $\mathcal{O}(p^6/\langle S \rangle^2)$ or $\mathcal{O}(p^6/\Lambda^2)$ or smaller (neither of the latter have any logs). The universal part of the bosonized quark determinant is given by the logarithmic terms, whereas the coefficients of next-to-leading terms do substantially depend on the shape of the regulator. In the retained terms all the information concerning the preparation of the effective action is contained in only two parameters: Λ and μ . The approximation based on retaining the action (94) is provided by the large- Λ and large-log limit. Of course we could well have used another regulator instead of the Θ function, such as e.g. an exponential damping factor, to compute the fermion determinant. If so the terms not included in (94), which are non-universal, would change, but so would the bare coefficients of our effective action at scale Λ , since they are defined by integrating out modes above Λ . The result should indeed be scheme independent.

After substitution of (93) in (94) one obtains the bosonic form of the ECQM action (83) with the lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L}(\Sigma, \xi, \tilde{\Pi}) = \mathcal{L}_{bos} + \mathcal{L}_{1-loop}. \quad (95)$$

⁷Compare with [16] where a different regularization was used.

The saddle point of the action (86) obtained from the above lagrangian is the relevant configuration for perturbing around in the large N_c limit. Due to the chiral symmetry the effective action does not depend on constant chiral fields ξ_0 . The effective potential for constant $\langle H \rangle \equiv H_0 = \Sigma_0 + i\Pi_0^a \tau^a$ can then easily be derived

$$V_{eff}(\Sigma_0, \Pi_0^a, M_0) = N_c \left\{ \frac{\Lambda^2}{g_{S0}} (\Sigma_0 - M_0)^2 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{g_{P1}} (\Pi_0^a)^2 + \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \left[-2\Lambda^2 |H_0|^2 \ln \frac{\mu^2}{\Lambda^2} + |H_0|^4 \left(\ln \frac{\mu^2}{|H_0|^2} + \frac{1}{2} \right) + \Lambda^4 \ln \frac{\mu^2}{\Lambda^2} \right] \right\}. \quad (96)$$

where $|H_0|^2 = \Sigma_0^2 + (\Pi_0^a)^2$. In the above expression for the effective potential we have already retained the universal logarithmically enhanced terms only. The finite constants (except one which has been kept for later convenience) have been absorbed by a finite redefinition of the appropriate coupling constants. The saddle-point equations (or mass-gap equations) will determine the extremum of V_{eff}

$$\frac{\partial V_{eff}}{\partial \Sigma_0} = 0 \iff \frac{\Lambda^2}{g_{S0}} (\Sigma_0 - M_0) = \frac{\Sigma_0}{4\pi^2} \left(\Lambda^2 \ln \frac{\mu^2}{\Lambda^2} - |H_0|^2 \ln \frac{\mu^2}{|H_0|^2} \right), \quad (97)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial V_{eff}}{\partial \Pi_0^a} = 0 \iff \Pi_0^a \left[\frac{\Lambda^2}{g_{P1}} - \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \left(\Lambda^2 \ln \frac{\mu^2}{\Lambda^2} - |H_0|^2 \ln \frac{\mu^2}{|H_0|^2} \right) \right] = 0, \quad (98)$$

Evidently, the above effective potential has to be renormalized to eliminate the dependence on the arbitrary scale μ . To eliminate the μ dependence we redefine the four fermion coupling constants and the chiral invariant mass M_0

$$\frac{1}{g_{S0}(\Lambda)} \equiv \frac{1}{g_{S0}(\mu)} - \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \ln \frac{\mu^2}{\Lambda^2}, \quad \frac{1}{g_{P1}(\Lambda)} \equiv \frac{1}{g_{P1}(\mu)} - \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \ln \frac{\mu^2}{\Lambda^2}, \quad (99)$$

$$M_0(\Lambda) = M_0(\mu) \frac{g_{S0}(\Lambda)}{g_{S0}(\mu)}, \quad (100)$$

or, in differential form,

$$\mu \frac{\partial g_{S0}}{\partial \mu} = -\frac{g_{S0}^2}{2\pi^2}, \quad \mu \frac{\partial g_{P1}}{\partial \mu} = -\frac{g_{P1}^2}{2\pi^2}, \quad \mu \frac{\partial M_0}{\partial \mu} = -g_{S0} \frac{M_0}{2\pi^2}. \quad (101)$$

These renormalization group equations coincide with those obtained by diagrammatic methods in the large N_c limit. They are not enough, however, to fully remove the μ dependence. Some pieces not originally present in the ECQM are needed to render V_{eff} truly μ independent. They are related to quark self-interaction operators of dimension higher than 6. In particular, the logarithmic terms proportional to $|H|^4$ in (96) are related to eight-fermion operators of dimension 12 which generate similar $|H|^4$ - terms after bosonization (see [6]). In the bosonic language this implies adding a piece $\lambda(\mu)|H|^4$ in V_{eff} where

$$\mu \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \mu} = -\frac{1}{4\pi^2}. \quad (102)$$

That such higher dimensional operator (in the original fermionic variables) is required is due to the fact that chiral and canonical dimensions do not coincide. In addition we need to add the field independent pieces

$$- \frac{N_c \Lambda^2 M_0^2(\mu)}{g_{S0}(\mu)} - N_c \Lambda^4 \ln \frac{\mu^2}{\Lambda^2} \quad (103)$$

to the vacuum energy. Then $dV_{eff}/d\mu = 0$.

Note that the renormalization group does not uniquely fix the form of the effective potential. We can in fact add to the low-energy effective potential V_{eff} any dimension four polynomial constructed from the renormalization group invariants Λ^2 and M_0/g_{S0} and still have $dV_{eff}/d\mu = 0$. These pieces would correspond to bare contributions which are not logarithmically enhanced.

Matching with QCD suggests that just below the CSB scale the coupling constants g_{S0}, g_{P1} , λ , etc. must be in some sense small (for M_0 this means $M_0 \ll \Lambda$). We also expect the total constituent mass to satisfy $\langle H_0 \rangle \ll \Lambda$. We would expect these constants to grow as we move away from the scale Λ and we depart more and more from perturbative QCD. Indeed, the previous renormalization group analysis shows that these constants run and, for instance in the case of g_{S0} , g_{P1} , and M_0 grow as the energy decreases, which is just what we naively expect.

After renormalizing all the coupling constants to the value they take at the scale Λ , the effective potential in the leading log approximation takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} V_{eff}(\Sigma_0, \Pi_0^a, M_0) \simeq & V_{eff}(0, 0, M_0) \\ & + N_c \left\{ \frac{\Lambda^2}{g_{S0}} (\Sigma_0^2 - 2M_0 \Sigma_0) + \frac{\Lambda^2}{g_{P1}} (\Pi_0^a)^2 \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{8\pi^2} |H_0|^4 \ln \frac{\Lambda^2}{|H_0|^2} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (104)$$

where we have neglected the term proportional to λ as well as any remaining non-logarithmic pieces. Unless explicitly stated otherwise, from now on we will take our coupling constants to be defined at scale Λ ; that is, at the CSB scale.

We expect the pseudoscalar coupling g_{P1} to be bounded in its negative values

$$\frac{\Lambda^2}{g_{P1}} > -\frac{|H_0|^2}{4\pi^2} \ln \frac{\Lambda^2}{|H_0|^2}. \quad (105)$$

Indeed if the opposite inequality held then the dynamical breaking of the $SU(2)$ isospin symmetry down to a $U(1)$ subgroup would occur and $\langle \tilde{\Pi}^3 \rangle \equiv \Pi_0^3 \neq 0$. As it also would break P we cannot accept to have this phase in the hadrodynamics at normal conditions. If (105) holds then the real scalar v.e.v. $\langle H \rangle = \Sigma_0$, $\langle \tilde{\Pi}^a \rangle = 0$ delivers the appropriate solution of the mass gap equations and determines the minimum of the effective potential.

As for the effective scalar coupling it may take a priori any values. Let us first consider the case where $g_{S0} \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$. In terms of the effective coupling the mass-gap equation reads

$$\frac{\Lambda^2}{g_{S0}} (\Sigma_0 - M_0) = -\frac{\Sigma_0^3}{4\pi^2} \ln \frac{\Lambda^2}{\Sigma_0^2}. \quad (106)$$

Just as we expect $M_0 \ll \Lambda$, we presume that the total constituent mass $\Sigma_0 \ll \Lambda$. Solutions to the gap equation exist for $g_{S0} > 0$

$$\Sigma_0 = M_0 \left(1 + O\left(\frac{M_0^2}{\Lambda^2}\right) \right), \quad \Sigma_0 < M_0. \quad (107)$$

For $g_{S0} < 0$ this solution does not provide a minimum. On the contrary solutions for negative g_{S0} exist for g_{S0} large enough, which is best studied by introducing

$$\bar{g}_S \equiv g_{S0} \frac{M_0^2}{\Lambda^2} I_0, \quad \bar{g}_P \equiv g_{P1} \frac{M_0^2}{\Lambda^2} I_0, \quad I_0 \equiv \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \ln \frac{\Lambda^2}{M_0^2}. \quad (108)$$

We will call from now on strong coupling regime the one characterized by $\bar{g}_S \simeq \bar{g}_P \simeq \mathcal{O}(1)$ and, accordingly, the weak coupling regime will correspond to $\bar{g}_S \simeq \bar{g}_P \ll 1$. The effective potential written in these variables reads

$$V_{eff}(\Sigma_0, \Pi_0^a, M_0) \simeq V_{eff}(0, 0, M_0) + N_c I_0 \left\{ \frac{M_0^2}{\bar{g}_S} (\Sigma_0^2 - 2M_0 \Sigma_0) + \frac{M_0^2}{\bar{g}_P} (\Pi_0^a)^2 + \frac{1}{2} |H_0|^4 \right\}. \quad (109)$$

It is also convenient to introduce the variable $x = \Sigma_0/M_0$. With its help the mass-gap equation, retaining the logarithmically enhanced terms only, looks as follows

$$\bar{g}_S x^3 + (x - 1) \simeq 0. \quad (110)$$

This expression shows that $\bar{g}_S$ (and $\bar{g}_P$) are the natural variables in terms of which we can speak of weak or strong four fermion interactions. Notice that the original variables g_{S0} and g_{P1} were accompanied only by the N_c and Λ factors to make them dimensionless and of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ in the large N_c limit, but it was not clear which was the natural normalization. For positive $\bar{g}_S$ it is evident that the equation (110) has only one real, positive solution $0 < x < 1$. Its asymptotic behaviours are

$$x \sim 1, \quad \bar{g}_S \ll 1, \quad x \sim (\bar{g}_S)^{-1/3}, \quad \bar{g}_S \gg 1, \quad (111)$$

As mentioned above, in the strong coupling regime one can reach ‘overcritical’ values of the scalar coupling, i.e. $\bar{g}_S < 0$. In this case the mass-gap eq.(110) has always one negative solution which corresponds to the absolute minimum of the effective potential. The asymptotic expression for this solution is

$$x \sim (\bar{g}_S)^{-1/3}, \quad \bar{g}_S \ll -1; \quad x \sim -|\bar{g}_S|^{-1/2}, \quad 0 > \bar{g}_S \gg -1, \quad (112)$$

Evidently the solution $x < 0$ always exists whereas real positive solutions arise only for $0 > \bar{g}_S \geq -4/27$ and they never provide comparable minima. In all cases physically acceptable solutions must lie in the range

$$\frac{\Lambda}{|M_0|} \gg |x| \gg \frac{|M_0|}{\Lambda}. \quad (113)$$

We notice that the sign of the total constituent mass Σ_0 and the sign (so far unspecified) of M_0 are opposite in the overcritical regime in order to deliver an absolute minimum of the effective potential.

5. Mass spectrum of scalar and pseudoscalar states

In order to find the mass spectrum of bosonic states in the large N_c limit we expand the effective action $\mathcal{W}$ in scalar, $\tilde{\sigma} \equiv \Sigma - \Sigma_0$, and pseudoscalar, $\tilde{\pi}$, $\tilde{\Pi}$ fluctuations around the corresponding vacuum expectation values.

We can read the kinetic term for the scalar meson from (94), (96)

$$\mathcal{W}_S^{(2)} = \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \tilde{\sigma}(p) K_S(p^2) \tilde{\sigma}(-p), \quad (114)$$

where

$$K_S(p^2) = N_c \left[\frac{2\Lambda^2}{g_{S0}} + (6\Sigma_0^2 + p^2) I_0 \right]. \quad (115)$$

The normalization of the kinetic term leads to the physical scalar field σ

$$\sigma = \sqrt{N_c I_0} \tilde{\sigma}. \quad (116)$$

Its mass is

$$m_\sigma^2 = \frac{2\Lambda^2}{g_{S0} I_0} + 6\Sigma_0^2. \quad (117)$$

The kinetic term for pseudoscalar states is derived by means of the expansion of the effective action in powers of $\tilde{\Pi}^a$ and $a_\mu \simeq i\partial_\mu \tilde{\pi}(x)/F_0$. The calculation of the quadratic part respecting the chiral symmetry can be done directly from the action (94), the effective potential (96) and the mass-gap equation (106)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_P^{(2)} = & \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \left[\tilde{\pi}^a(p) \frac{p^2}{F_0^2} (f_0^2 + N_c g_A^2 \Sigma_0^2 I_0) \tilde{\pi}^a(-p) \right. \\ & - \tilde{\pi}^a(p) p^2 \frac{2N_c g_A \Sigma_0 I_0}{F_0} \tilde{\Pi}^a(-p) \\ & \left. + \tilde{\Pi}^a(p) N_c \left(p^2 I_0 + \frac{2\Lambda^2}{g_{P1}} + 2\Sigma_0^2 I_0 \right) \tilde{\Pi}^a(-p) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (118)$$

This form can be diagonalized and normalized with the choice of the bare pion decay constant

$$F_0 = \sqrt{f_0^2 + N_c \Sigma_0^2 g_A^2 I_0}, \quad (119)$$

and thus one determines the physical fields π , Π

$$\tilde{\pi}^a = \pi^a + \frac{\Sigma_0 g_A \sqrt{N_c I_0}}{f_0} \Pi^a, \quad \tilde{\Pi}^a = \frac{F_0}{f_0 \sqrt{N_c I_0}} \Pi^a. \quad (120)$$

As expected one obtains one massless and one massive pseudoscalar state with a mass

$$m_\Pi^2 = \frac{2F_0^2}{I_0 f_0^2} \left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{g_{P1}} + \Sigma_0^2 I_0 \right), \quad (121)$$

where the relation (119) has been used.

In the weak coupling regime terms quadratic in Λ dominate in (117), (121)

$$m_\sigma^2 \simeq \frac{2\Lambda^2}{g_{S0}I_0}; \quad m_\Pi^2 \simeq \frac{2F_0^2\Lambda^2}{g_{P1}I_0f_0^2} \equiv m_\sigma^2 \frac{\gamma}{\delta^2} \quad \text{with} \quad \gamma \equiv \frac{g_{S0}}{g_{P1}}; \quad \delta \equiv \frac{f_0}{F_0} < 1. \quad (122)$$

Both masses are generated at the scale Λ and due to I_0 in the denominator lighter than Λ by a logarithmic factor. Notice that if both masses are comparable, i.e. $m_\sigma^2/m_\Pi^2 = \mathcal{O}(1)$, then $f_0^2/F_0^2 = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and f_0^2 must also be logarithmically enhanced.

In the strong coupling regime it is more natural to use $\bar{g}_S$ and $\bar{g}_P$. The corresponding spectrum is then given by eqs. (117), (121) and in terms of the notations in (110), (122)

$$m_\sigma^2 = 2M_0^2\left(\frac{1}{\bar{g}_S} + 3x^2\right), \quad m_\Pi^2 = \frac{2M_0^2}{\delta^2}\left(\frac{\gamma}{\bar{g}_S} + x^2\right). \quad (123)$$

The ratio of the masses is controlled by the constants δ and γ for different values of $\bar{g}_S$. We notice that in terms of the rescaled constants $\bar{g}_S$, $\bar{g}_P$ the major mass scale is M_0 and the scale Λ is involved only in the definition of the parameter I_0 .

6. External sources, F_π and current quark masses

External vector, axial-vector, scalar and pseudoscalar sources are included in the basic QCD quark action with the help of the extension (87) of the Dirac operator. In the low energy effective action below the chiral symmetry breaking scale implemented by the ECQM, external sources are coupled to fermions in the same way, but, in addition, they appear through the derivatives acting on chiral fields

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\mu U &\longrightarrow D_\mu U \equiv \partial_\mu U + [\bar{V}_\mu, U] - \{\bar{A}_\mu, U\}, \\ l_\mu &= U^\dagger D_\mu U, \quad r_\mu = -D_\mu U U^\dagger. \end{aligned} \quad (124)$$

It is known that in this way the CVC and PCAC identities hold. As a consequence, in the rotated basis of constituent quark fields, Q_L, Q_R , one arrives to the following modification of the induced effective vector and axial-vector fields in (93)

$$\begin{aligned} V_\mu &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\xi^\dagger \partial_\mu \xi - \partial_\mu \xi \xi^\dagger + \xi^\dagger \bar{V}_\mu \xi + \xi \bar{V}_\mu \xi^\dagger - \xi^\dagger \bar{A}_\mu \xi + \xi \bar{A}_\mu \xi^\dagger \right) \\ A_\mu &= -\frac{1}{2} g_A \left(\xi^\dagger \partial_\mu \xi + \partial_\mu \xi \xi^\dagger + \xi^\dagger \bar{V}_\mu \xi - \xi \bar{V}_\mu \xi^\dagger - \xi^\dagger \bar{A}_\mu \xi - \xi \bar{A}_\mu \xi^\dagger \right). \end{aligned} \quad (125)$$

When substituted in (94) they provide the bosonized matrix elements of quark currents by performing the appropriate functional derivatives. In particular this allows us to determine the weak decay constant of the pion after an axial-vector source $\bar{A}_\mu$ is incorporated into the lagrangian. Linearizing the matrix U , this amounts to the replacement

$$\partial_\mu \tilde{\pi} \longrightarrow \partial_\mu \tilde{\pi} + 2iF_0 \bar{A}_\mu, \quad (126)$$

which produces the following piece in the lagrangian

$$-iF_0 \text{tr} \left(\partial_\mu \pi \bar{A}_\mu \right) \quad (127)$$

and thus we conclude that $F_\pi = F_0$, with F_0 given by (119). One can also check that the decoupling of the additional heavy pseudoscalar field Π from the axial current is exact in the chiral limit and that the chiral symmetry is realized in the EPCAC way[17]. The identification of F_π is slightly more subtle away from the chiral limit.

Let us introduce the current quark mass $m_q > 0$ and, at the same time, prepare our effective action for the derivation of two-point correlators for scalar and pseudoscalar currents. These correlators can be obtained from the vacuum generating functional of QCD if one incorporates scalar $\bar{S}(x)$ and pseudoscalar $\bar{P}(x)$ external sources by functional derivation with respect to them. We supplement (74) with

$$\Delta\mathcal{L}_{ECQM} = i\bar{q} \left(m_q + Z_m(\bar{S} + i\gamma_5\bar{P}) \right) q. \quad (128)$$

The constant Z_m is introduced in a chirally symmetric way to provide the counterterms for the renormalization of the scalar and pseudoscalar densities (see section 7). The current mass can obviously be reinterpreted as a non-zero constant value for the source $\tilde{S}(x) = m_q + Z_m\bar{S}(x)$. Eq. (128) breaks chiral invariance, but this formally holds if we assume that the external sources rotate appropriately under chiral transformations

$$\mathcal{M} \equiv m_q + Z_m(\bar{S} + i\bar{P}), \quad \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \Omega_R \mathcal{M} \Omega_L^\dagger, \quad q_L \rightarrow \Omega_L q_L, \quad q_R \rightarrow \Omega_R q_R. \quad (129)$$

After the explicit inclusion of the Goldstone boson degrees of freedom in the effective action below the chiral symmetry breaking scale we parametrize the residual gluon interactions in terms of local operators. In addition to those already considered, there are, away from the chiral limit, quite a few more that one can write by including the matrix $\mathcal{M}$ and using the transformations (129). One such operator is the counterpart of the term with the bare pion decay constant f_0 , which, as we have seen, plays a crucial role to make the field Π a propagating one. It is

$$c_1 \text{tr} \left(\mathcal{M} U^\dagger + \mathcal{M}^\dagger U \right). \quad (130)$$

There are several operators linear in the scalar source of chiral dimension ≤ 4 . One of them is

$$c_2 \text{tr} \left((U^\dagger \mathcal{M} + \mathcal{M}^\dagger U) l_\mu l_\mu \right), \quad (131)$$

and it is in fact the only relevant one since $\text{tr} \left(\mathcal{M} U^\dagger + \mathcal{M}^\dagger U \right) \text{tr} (l_\mu l_\mu)$ is, in fact, not independent for $SU(2)$ and $\text{tr} \left((U^\dagger \mathcal{M} + \mathcal{M}^\dagger U) D_\mu l_\mu \right)$ can be reduced with the help of the EOM.

There are several operators quadratic in the current masses. The relevant one is

$$c_3 \text{tr} \left(\mathcal{M} U^\dagger \mathcal{M} U^\dagger + U \mathcal{M}^\dagger U \mathcal{M}^\dagger \right), \quad (132)$$

since other operators quadratic in m_q are either subleading in N_c or U -independent

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{tr} \left(\mathcal{M} U^\dagger \right) \text{tr} \left(\mathcal{M} U^\dagger \right) + \text{tr} \left(\mathcal{M}^\dagger U \right) \text{tr} \left(\mathcal{M}^\dagger U \right), \\ & \text{tr} \left(\mathcal{M} U^\dagger \right) \text{tr} \left(\mathcal{M}^\dagger U \right), \\ & \text{tr} \left(\mathcal{M} \mathcal{M}^\dagger \right). \end{aligned} \quad (133)$$

We shall not go beyond this order and, in fact, we shall consider two-point correlators in the chiral limit only.

In the fermion sector there are several operators with the required invariance properties and linear in $\mathcal{M}$. The possible dimension 4 operators without derivatives are

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{q}_R \mathcal{M} q_L + \bar{q}_L \mathcal{M}^\dagger q_R, \\ & \bar{q}_R U \mathcal{M}^\dagger U q_L + \bar{q}_L U^\dagger \mathcal{M} U^\dagger q_R, \\ & \bar{q}_R U q_L \text{tr}(\mathcal{M} U^\dagger) + \bar{q}_L U^\dagger q_R \text{tr}(U \mathcal{M}^\dagger), \\ & \bar{q}_R U q_L \text{tr}(U \mathcal{M}^\dagger) + \bar{q}_L U^\dagger q_R \text{tr}(\mathcal{M} U^\dagger). \end{aligned} \quad (134)$$

Those containing the additional trace will be of subleading order in the large N_c expansion and thus not considered here. Operators containing twice the source $\mathcal{M}$ give eventually contributions which are down by a power of Σ_0^2/Λ^2 and will be neglected accordingly.

Higher-dimensional operators with derivatives containing $\mathcal{M}$ can be reduced with the help of the EOM either to the operators (134) or to a set of operators which contribute to the next-to-leading order of the large N_c expansion and therefore can be neglected.

In the rotated quark basis, the only two relevant operators are as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{Q}_R \xi^\dagger \mathcal{M} \xi^\dagger Q_L + \bar{Q}_L \xi \mathcal{M}^\dagger \xi Q_R, \\ & \bar{Q}_R \xi \mathcal{M}^\dagger \xi Q_L + \bar{Q}_L \xi^\dagger \mathcal{M} \xi^\dagger Q_R. \end{aligned} \quad (135)$$

Their existence is due to the nonlinear realization of the chiral symmetry on the fields $\xi, \xi^\dagger$ (77) resulting in a hidden vector symmetry representation on products

$$\begin{aligned} \xi \mathcal{M}^\dagger \xi & \longrightarrow h_\xi \xi \mathcal{M}^\dagger \xi h_\xi^\dagger, \\ \xi^\dagger \mathcal{M} \xi^\dagger & \longrightarrow h_\xi \xi^\dagger \mathcal{M} \xi^\dagger h_\xi^\dagger. \end{aligned} \quad (136)$$

In principle these terms have different coupling constants unless a hidden left-right symmetry holds, $Q_L \leftrightarrow Q_R$. In the QCD low energy effective action one would not a priori expect to have this symmetry. However its appearance could be revealed from the meson phenomenology (see section 8).

Thus we supplement the ECQM lagrangian with the following piece

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \mathcal{L}_{ECQM} &= i\left(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon\right) \left(\bar{Q}_R \xi^\dagger \mathcal{M} \xi^\dagger Q_L + \bar{Q}_L \xi \mathcal{M}^\dagger \xi Q_R \right) \\ &+ i\left(\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon\right) \left(\bar{Q}_R \xi \mathcal{M}^\dagger \xi Q_L + \bar{Q}_L \xi^\dagger \mathcal{M} \xi^\dagger Q_R \right) \\ &+ c_1 \text{tr}(\mathcal{M} U^\dagger + \mathcal{M}^\dagger U) \\ &+ c_2 \text{tr}((U^\dagger \mathcal{M} + \mathcal{M}^\dagger U) l_\mu l_\mu) \\ &+ c_3 \text{tr}(\mathcal{M} U^\dagger \mathcal{M} U^\dagger + U \mathcal{M}^\dagger U \mathcal{M}^\dagger), \end{aligned} \quad (137)$$

where ϵ and c_1, c_2, c_3 are real coupling constants. The above mentioned hypothetical left-right symmetry would correspond to $\epsilon = 0$. We notice that the choice of the

couplings is made so that the mass term corresponding to $\mathcal{M} = m_q$ in the lowest order chiral interaction, $U = 1$, coincides with the QCD mass term for low energy quark fields.

After the introduction of auxiliary scalar and pseudoscalar fields just as in (81) we perform a shift of variables to simplify the structure of the quark determinant as in (82). Thus we define

$$\tilde{\Sigma} + i\tilde{\Pi} \equiv \tilde{\sigma} + i\tilde{\Pi}' + \Sigma_0 - M_0 - \left(\left(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon \right) \xi^\dagger \mathcal{M} \xi^\dagger + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon \right) \xi \mathcal{M}^\dagger \xi \right) - \frac{\delta f_0}{\Lambda^2} a_\mu a_\mu, \quad (138)$$

with $\tilde{\sigma} = \Sigma - \Sigma_0$.

The shift (138) allows us to move the dependence on scalar sources to the purely bosonic part of the effective action $\mathcal{L}_{bos}$, which is now modified by the following terms (we keep only those which will be relevant in the following discussion)

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \mathcal{L}_{bos} = & \left(c_1 - \frac{N_c \Lambda^2 (\Sigma_0 - M_0)}{2g_{S0}} \right) \text{tr} (\mathcal{M} U^\dagger + \mathcal{M}^\dagger U) \\ & + \left(c_2 + \frac{N_c \delta f_0}{2g_{S0}} \right) \text{tr} ((U^\dagger \mathcal{M} + \mathcal{M}^\dagger U) l_\mu l_\mu) \\ & - \frac{N_c \Lambda^2}{2g_{S0}} \tilde{\sigma} \text{tr} (\mathcal{M} U^\dagger + \mathcal{M}^\dagger U) - \frac{N_c \delta f_0}{g_{S0}} \tilde{\sigma} \text{tr} (l_\mu l_\mu) \\ & + i\epsilon \frac{N_c \Lambda^2}{g_{P1}} \text{tr} (\tilde{\Pi}' (\xi^\dagger \mathcal{M} \xi^\dagger - \xi \mathcal{M}^\dagger \xi)) \\ & + \left(c_3 + \frac{N_c \Lambda^2}{8g_{S0}} - \frac{4\epsilon^2 N_c \Lambda^2}{8g_{P1}} \right) \text{tr} (\mathcal{M} U^\dagger \mathcal{M} U^\dagger + \mathcal{M}^\dagger U \mathcal{M}^\dagger U). \quad (139) \end{aligned}$$

We notice that the difference between the two kinds of mass terms appears only in the pseudoscalar channel. We also notice that there are two different contact terms contributing to the scalar-axial-axial three point function, one proportional to c_2 , the other proportional to δf_0 . In fact, as it will be discussed in the coming section in more detail, QCD dictates that the sum of the two pieces just above the scale Λ must be zero. The only sizeable contribution to the scalar-axial-axial vertex is the one induced by the exchange of the σ particle, which indeed vanishes as $1/p^2$. Finally, the scalar and pseudoscalar correlators have also some contact terms, which can be read from the last line in (139). QCD has also something to say on that particular combination of coefficients.

Let us analyze the influence of current masses of light quarks on the mass-gap solution and on the effective potential. We neglect the isospin breaking effects (with respect to $SU(2)_V$) and take $\mathcal{M} = m_q \mathbf{I}$. From (139) we immediately read the modification in part of the effective potential linear in m_q (taking into account that $\langle \tilde{\sigma} \rangle = 0$)

$$\Delta V_{eff} = \left(4c_1 - \frac{2N_c \Lambda^2 (\Sigma_0 - M_0)}{g_{S0}} \right) m_q^U, \quad (140)$$

where

$$m_q^U \equiv m_q \cos \phi, \quad \cos \phi \equiv \frac{1}{4} \text{tr} (U + U^\dagger). \quad (141)$$

We shall assume, as is commonly done, that $\langle \cos \phi \rangle = 1$. Other choices of the chiral vacuum lead to different phases for M_0 , the chiral condensate, etc.

Just as the other parameters in the theory, we have to renormalize m_q to absorb the logs associated to the running between the scales μ and Λ . Its renormalization can, for instance, be obtained diagrammatically and is identical to that of M_0

$$\frac{m_q(\mu)}{g_{S0}(\mu)} = \frac{m_q(\Lambda)}{g_{S0}(\Lambda)}, \quad m_q(\Lambda) = \frac{m_q(\mu)}{1 - \frac{g_{S0}(\mu)}{4\pi^2} \ln \frac{\mu^2}{\Lambda^2}}, \quad (142)$$

Another way of seeing this is by realizing that to make the effective potential renormalization group invariant in the presence of the soft breaking induced by the mass term we have to add a piece similar to the first term in (103), namely

$$- \frac{N_c \Lambda^2}{g_{S0}} (M_0 + m_q^U)^2 \quad (143)$$

which, unlike (103), is now field dependent. Its origin is obviously nothing but the terms (130) and (132). We thus see that it is necessary to include the operator (130) from the beginning and that

$$c_1(\Lambda) = -\frac{N_c \Lambda^2 M_0}{2g_{S0}} + \tilde{c}_1(\Lambda), \quad (144)$$

where $\tilde{c}_1(\Lambda)$ contains other contributions which cannot be deduced from renormalization group arguments alone (and which for this reason are not expected to be logarithmically enhanced either). In any case the combination

$$2c_1(\mu)g_{S0}(\mu) + N_c \Lambda^2 M_0(\mu) = 2c_1(\Lambda)g_{S0}(\Lambda) + N_c \Lambda^2 M_0(\Lambda) \quad (145)$$

is a renormalization group invariant.

The modified mass-gap equation is (from now on we take $\langle \cos \phi \rangle = 1$ and thus $m_q^U = m_q$)

$$\frac{\Lambda^2}{g_{S0}} (\Sigma_0 - M_0 - m_q) = -\frac{\Sigma_0^3}{4\pi^2} \ln \frac{\Lambda^2}{\Sigma_0^2}. \quad (146)$$

Let us use the fact that m_q is a small parameter and let us calculate the solution as a perturbation from the chirally symmetric one

$$\Sigma_0(m_q) = \Sigma_0(0) + m_q \Delta + O(m_q^2) \quad \Delta = \frac{\Sigma_0(0)}{3M_0 - 2\Sigma_0(0)} < 1. \quad (147)$$

In the weak coupling regime the solution is $\Sigma_0 \simeq M_0 + m_q$ with $M_0 \gg m_q$ by assumption. In the strong coupling regime it is helpful again to invoke the notation of (108) to present the mass-gap equation in the form of (110)

$$\bar{g}_S x^3 + (x - 1 - \frac{m_q}{M_0}) \simeq 0, \quad (148)$$

with the approximate solution

$$x = x_0 + \frac{x_0}{3 - 2x_0} \cdot \frac{m_q}{M_0} = x_0 + \frac{1}{3\bar{g}_S x_0^2 + 1} \cdot \frac{m_q}{M_0}, \quad x_0 \equiv \frac{\Sigma_0(0)}{M_0}. \quad (149)$$

This expression is valid for both subcritical, $\bar{g}_S > 0$, and overcritical, $\bar{g}_S < 0$, regimes. As we shall see later on (see (189)) the correct sign for the chiral constant L_5 for all values of g_S is obtained only if the bare constituent mass M_0 has the same sign as m_q (positive in our conventions). Due to the mass-gap equation the total constituent mass Σ_0 which corresponds to the absolute minimum for the effective potential takes the opposite sign in the overcritical strong coupling regime. Thus Σ_0 is positive in the weak coupling regime and in the subcritical strong coupling one, but negative for overcritical values of $\bar{g}_S$. (See the discussion at the end of the previous section.)

Now we derive the correction to the value of the effective potential (96) at the minimum due to the presence of the current quark mass (140). Substituting (146) into the effective potential (including (140)) and keeping terms linear in m_q , one finds for the vacuum energy

$$V_{eff}^{min} = V_{eff}^{min}(m_q = 0) + m_q \left(4c_1 + \frac{N_c}{2\pi^2} \Sigma_0^3 \ln \frac{\Lambda^2}{\Sigma_0^2} \right). \quad (150)$$

The physical quark condensate in Minkowski space, renormalized at scale Λ will be

$$C_q = i \langle \bar{q}q \rangle_{eucl} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial V_{eff}^{min}}{\partial m_q}. \quad (151)$$

Namely

$$C_q(\Lambda) = \left(2c_1 + \frac{N_c}{4\pi^2} \Sigma_0^3 \ln \frac{\Lambda^2}{\Sigma_0^2} \right). \quad (152)$$

Expanding the chiral field U around the identity and using (140) one finds the Gell-Mann-Oakes-Renner formula [13] for the pion mass: $m_\pi^2 F_0^2 \simeq -2m_q C_q$. The pion mass has the correct physical sign provided that $C_q \leq 0$. Since we will see later that in the weak coupling regime M_0 and, consequently, Σ_0 must be positive, the second term in the first line of (152) is positive and we conclude that c_1 must be negative and large enough, lest the pion be a tachyon. Thus the bare coefficient c_1 provides a contribution to the condensate which is bigger than the one induced by the fermion loop after integration. Taking a look at (143) we will see that in the large log approximation this is the case. In the overcritical regime, $g_{S0} < 0$, the constant c_1 is less crucial as the accompanying term becomes negative.

Let us now calculate the effects due to the soft CSB induced by the current quark mass. They arise from the perturbed solution $\Sigma_0(m_q)$ of the mass gap equation (147) in the first place, but they also modify the pseudoscalar mass matrix from (139)

$$\Delta \mathcal{L}_P^{(2)} = \frac{1}{2} \left(2m_q B_0 (\tilde{\pi}^a)^2 + \frac{8N_c \Lambda^2}{g_{P1} F_0} \epsilon m_q \tilde{\pi}^a \tilde{\Pi}'^a \right), \quad (153)$$

with $B_0 \equiv |C_q|/F_0^2$. We notice that the parameter ϵ cannot be in general renormalization independent if $g_{P1} \neq g_{S0}$. Its renormalization should be given by

$$\epsilon(\mu) \frac{g_{S0}(\mu)}{g_{P1}(\mu)} = \epsilon(\Lambda) \frac{g_{S0}(\Lambda)}{g_{P1}(\Lambda)}. \quad (154)$$

After the diagonalization of the kinetic term with the help of variables (120) (with $\tilde{\Pi}$ replaced by $\tilde{\Pi}'$) the mass matrix in the pseudoscalar sector $\mathbf{M}_P$ is still non-diagonal away from the chiral limit

$$\mathbf{M}_P = \begin{pmatrix} m_\pi^2 & d_1 m_\pi^2 \\ d_1 m_\pi^2 & m_\Pi^2(0) + d_2 m_\pi^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (155)$$

where the following notations are employed

$$\begin{aligned} m_\pi^2 &= 2m_q B_0, \\ d_1 &= \frac{2\sqrt{N_c}\Lambda^2\epsilon}{g_{P1}B_0f_0\sqrt{I_0}} + \frac{\sqrt{F_0^2 - f_0^2}}{f_0}, \\ d_2 &= \frac{\Delta}{B_0\Sigma_0} \left(m_\Pi^2(0) \left(1 - \frac{f_0^2}{F_0^2} \right) + \frac{2F_0^2\Sigma_0^2}{f_0^2} \right) + \frac{4N_c\Lambda^2\Sigma_0 g_A\epsilon}{g_{P1}B_0f_0^2} + \frac{N_c\Sigma_0^2 g_A^2 I_0}{f_0^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (156)$$

Then, rediagonalization of (155) induces the coupling of the physical heavy Π meson to the axial current from (127), something which is forbidden in the chiral limit. At first order in the current quark mass the corresponding decay constant is given by

$$F_\Pi = F_0 d_1 \frac{m_\pi^2}{m_\Pi^2(0)}. \quad (157)$$

The mass corrections to F_π will be discussed at the end of next section.

For completeness we also show the mass shift for heavy scalar and pseudoscalar mesons

$$\begin{aligned} m_\sigma^2(m_q) &= m_\sigma^2(0) + m_\pi^2 \frac{6\Sigma_0\Delta}{B_0} + O(m_\pi^4), \\ m_\Pi^2(m_q) &= m_\Pi^2(0) + d_2 m_\pi^2 + O(m_\pi^4). \end{aligned} \quad (158)$$

For $SU(2)$ these corrections are very small.

7. Correlators and chiral symmetry restoration

In large N_c QCD the two-point correlators of scalar and pseudoscalar quark densities are given by a regulated sum over the appropriate meson poles

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_S(p^2) &= - \int d^4x \exp(ipx) \langle T(\bar{q}q(x) \bar{q}q(0)) \rangle \\ &= \sum_n \frac{Z_n^S}{p^2 + m_{S,n}^2} + C_0^S + C_1^S p^2, \\ \Pi_P^{ab}(p^2) &= \int d^4x \exp(ipx) \langle T(\bar{q}\gamma_5\tau^a q(x) \bar{q}\gamma_5\tau^b q(0)) \rangle \\ &= \delta^{ab} \left(\sum_n \frac{Z_n^P}{p^2 + m_{P,n}^2} + C_0^P + C_1^P p^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (159)$$

C_0 and C_1 are regularization-dependent contact terms.

The high-energy asymptotics is controlled by perturbation theory and the operator product expansion due to the asymptotic freedom of QCD. In QCD the conventional derivative, $i\partial_\mu \rightarrow iD_\mu = i\partial_\mu + G_\mu$, contains gluon fields $G_\mu \equiv g_s \lambda^a G_\mu^a$, where $\text{tr}(\lambda^a \lambda^b) = 2\delta^{ab}$. In the chiral limit ($m_q = 0$) the scalar and pseudoscalar correlators have the following power-like behavior [18, 19] at large p^2

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{S,P}(p^2)|_{p^2 \rightarrow \infty} &\simeq \frac{N_c}{4\pi^2} \left(1 + \frac{11(N_c^2 - 1)\alpha_s}{8N_c\pi} \right) p^2 \ln \frac{p^2}{\mu^2} \\ &+ \frac{\alpha_s}{4\pi p^2} \langle (G_{\mu\nu}^a)^2 \rangle + \frac{2\pi\alpha_s}{3p^4} \langle \bar{q}\gamma_\mu \lambda^k q \bar{q}\gamma_\mu \lambda^k q \rangle \\ &\mp \frac{\pi\alpha_s}{p^4} \langle \bar{q}\sigma_{\mu\nu} \lambda^k q \bar{q}\sigma_{\mu\nu} \lambda^k q \rangle + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{p^6}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (160)$$

for $N_f = 2$, in euclidean notations. In the planar (large- N_c) limit⁸

$$\begin{aligned} (\Pi_P(p^2) - \Pi_S(p^2))|_{p^2 \rightarrow \infty} &\equiv \frac{\Delta_{SP}}{p^4} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{p^6}\right); \\ \Delta_{SP} &\simeq \frac{24(N_c^2 - 1)}{N_c^2} \pi \alpha_s C_q^2 \simeq 24B_0^2 F_0^4, \end{aligned} \quad (161)$$

where the vacuum dominance hypothesis[18] has been applied and we have taken[12] for simplicity $\alpha_s(1.2\text{GeV}) \simeq 1/3$.

This rapidly decreasing asymptotics is of course a consequence of the manifest chiral invariance of massless QCD. When comparing (159) and (160) one concludes that an infinite series of resonances with the same quantum numbers should exist in every channel in order to reproduce the perturbative asymptotics.

At scales below Λ , where chiral symmetry is dynamically broken, the previous equality needs not to be valid. However, the fact that chiral symmetry is restored so quickly at high energies suggests itself as a further constraint to impose on the ECQM. We shall demand that at the scale Λ , and within the precision of our approach, the relation (161) is approximately fulfilled. This we will call the chiral symmetry restoration (CSR) constraint [22] (similar CSR constraints in the vector-axial vector channels for specific models have been considered in [23, 24]). In this section we shall work out its consequences in the chiral limit ($m_q = 0$) and we will restrict ourselves mostly to the scalar and pseudoscalar two-point functions, although some three point functions will also be discussed.

In the ECQM the two-point correlators in the scalar and pseudoscalar channels are obtained by performing functional derivatives of the vacuum generating functional $\mathcal{Z}(\bar{S}, \bar{P})$ of the ECQM

$$\Pi_S(p^2) = \int d^4x \exp(ipx) \frac{\delta}{\delta \bar{S}(x)} \frac{\delta}{\delta \bar{S}(0)} \log \mathcal{Z}(\bar{S}, \bar{P})|_{\bar{S}, \bar{P}=0}$$

⁸ We should mention some discrepancies in the literature [18, 19, 20] concerning the signs of the last term in (160) and acknowledge S. Peris for bringing to our attention the paper [20] where the signs are proven to be correct. The correctness of the above signs can be verified by realizing that they provide the correct Weingarten inequality[21] between pseudoscalar and scalar two-point correlators when applied to the leading (logarithmic) singularity at short distances.

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{Z_\sigma}{p^2 + m_\sigma^2} + C^S(p^2), \\
\Pi_P^{ab}(p^2) &= \int d^4x \exp(ipx) \frac{\delta}{\delta \bar{P}^a(x)} \frac{\delta}{\delta \bar{P}^b(0)} \log \mathcal{Z}(\bar{S}, \bar{P})|_{\bar{S}, \bar{P}=0} \\
&= \delta^{ab} \left(\frac{Z_\pi}{p^2} + \frac{Z_\Pi}{p^2 + m_\Pi^2} + C^P(p^2) \right), \tag{162}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the chiral limit the masses m_i are given by eqs. (117), (121) and the parameters Z_i will be derived below. Since we are well below the heavier poles (located above Λ), the functions $C^S(p^2)$, $C^P(p^2)$ will be, by construction, finite polynomials in momenta in the ECQM

$$C^S(p^2) = C_0^S + p^2 C_1^S + \dots \quad C^P(p^2) = C_0^P + p^2 C_1^P + \dots \tag{163}$$

With this structure in mind the CSR constraint will basically involve the composite states π, Π, σ of the model and decouple from the effects of heavier degrees of freedom. This decoupling is always possible with a suitable choice of the coupling constants of local operators quadratic in the external sources.

When imposed on two-point correlators of the ECQM (in the chiral limit) the CSR condition leads to

$$C_0^S = C_0^P, \tag{164}$$

$$Z_\sigma = Z_\pi + Z_\Pi, \quad Z_\sigma > Z_\Pi, \tag{165}$$

$$Z_\sigma m_\sigma^2 = Z_\Pi m_\Pi^2 + \Delta_{SP}. \tag{166}$$

As for the constants C_1^S and C_1^P , the CSR constraint is automatically fulfilled in the minimal ECQM after imposing our selection rules since there are no contact terms with two derivatives acting on $\mathcal{M}$ of chiral dimension ≤ 4 . There is one operator of chiral dimension 4 that, on dimensional grounds, could contribute to the first condition (164), namely $\text{tr}(\mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}^\dagger)$, but it does not since scalar and pseudoscalar sources appear on equal footing in it. However, (164) does provide some information on the ECQM, namely

$$c_3 + \frac{N_c \Lambda^2}{8g_{S0}} - \frac{4\epsilon^2 N_c \Lambda^2}{8g_{P1}} = 0. \tag{167}$$

The constraints (165) and (166) allow to determine two constants Z_i in terms of a third one and meson masses. In particular

$$Z_\sigma = \frac{Z_\pi m_\Pi^2 - \Delta_{SP}}{m_\Pi^2 - m_\sigma^2}, \quad Z_\Pi = \frac{Z_\pi m_\sigma^2 - \Delta_{SP}}{m_\Pi^2 - m_\sigma^2}. \tag{168}$$

PCAC dictates that $Z_\pi = 4B_0^2 F_0^2$. We can use this relation in (168) to find the other Z 's. From phenomenology [12] $m_\Pi \simeq 1.3$ GeV and therefore $Z_\pi m_\Pi^2 > \Delta_{SP}$ when taking into account (161). Inasmuch as Z_σ is positive one derives from (168) that $m_\Pi^2 > m_\sigma^2$.

In order to use the relations (168) we must find the dependence of the constants Z_i on parameters of the ECQM. For this purpose we expand the appropriate part of

the ECQM lagrangian —extended with scalar and pseudoscalar sources— in powers of meson fields

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\mathcal{L}_{ECQM} = & Z_m \left[-\frac{2N_c\Lambda^2}{g_{S0}}\tilde{\sigma}\bar{S} - \frac{4N_c\Lambda^2\epsilon}{g_{P1}}\tilde{\Pi}^a\bar{P}^a \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{4}{F_0} \left(c_1 - \frac{N_c\Lambda^2(\Sigma_0 - M_0)}{2g_{S0}} \right) \tilde{\pi}^a\bar{P}^a \right], \end{aligned} \quad (169)$$

where Z_m was introduced in (128).

It is evident that the constant Z_m is required to renormalize the operators in (169) and obeys the following renormalization group equation

$$\frac{Z_m(\mu)}{g_{S0}(\mu)} = \frac{Z_m(\Lambda)}{g_{S0}(\Lambda)}. \quad (170)$$

We shall take $Z_m(\Lambda) = 1$. This amounts to fixing the normalization of the external sources at a given scale and we do not lose any generality by doing so. This convention simplifies the relation between Z_π and the quark condensate. Let us now diagonalize the kinetic term with the physical fields (116), (120) and adopt the following notations

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &\equiv \frac{2N_c\Lambda^2}{g_{S0}\sqrt{N_cI_0}} = \frac{2\sqrt{N_cI_0}M_0^2}{\bar{g}_S}, \\ \beta &\equiv \frac{4}{F_0\alpha} \left(\frac{N_c\Lambda^2(\Sigma_0 - M_0)}{2g_{S0}} - c_1 \right) = -\frac{2C_q}{F_0\alpha} = \frac{B_0F_0\bar{g}_S}{\sqrt{N_cI_0}M_0^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (171)$$

Then the operators linear in fields and external sources relevant for the derivation of two-point correlators can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\mathcal{L}_{ECQM} = & -\alpha\sigma\bar{S} - \alpha\beta\pi^a\bar{P}^a - \frac{\alpha(2\epsilon\gamma + \beta\sqrt{1-\delta^2})}{\delta}\Pi^a\bar{P}^a \\ & = \mp\sqrt{Z_\sigma}\sigma\bar{S} - \sqrt{Z_\pi}\pi^a\bar{P}^a \mp \sqrt{Z_\Pi}\Pi^a\bar{P}^a. \end{aligned} \quad (172)$$

Notice that only the sign of the second term is fixed. The sign of the other two terms depends on that of $\bar{g}_S$. From the first relation in (168) and comparing with (172) one finds that

$$\beta = \text{sign}(\bar{g}_S) \frac{\sqrt{1 - \frac{m_\sigma^2}{m_\Pi^2}}}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{\Delta_{SP}}{Z_\pi m_\Pi^2}}}, \quad \frac{\Delta_{SP}}{Z_\pi m_\Pi^2} \simeq \frac{6F_0^2}{m_\Pi^2} \simeq 0.03. \quad (173)$$

Thus, from phenomenology [12] $|\beta| < 1$. The relation (165) gives

$$2\epsilon\gamma = -\beta\sqrt{1-\delta^2} \pm \delta\sqrt{1-\beta^2}, \quad (174)$$

and, since $|\delta| < 1$, it follows that $|2\epsilon\gamma| \leq 1$.

We can also obtain F_σ from (172). The scalar decay constant is defined through the relation (recall the equivalent one for F_π)

$$2B_0F_\sigma = \sqrt{Z_\sigma}. \quad (175)$$

Therefore

$$F_\sigma = \frac{\sqrt{N_c I_0} M_0^2}{B_0 \bar{g}_S} = \frac{F_\pi}{\beta}. \quad (176)$$

We see that the CSR constraints represent a powerful tool to reduce the number of input parameters of the ECQM.

Another phenomenological condition enabling us to restrict the parameters of the ECQM is provided by the experimental determination of the chiral constant L_8 , which parametrizes the following operator in the low-energy chiral lagrangian (in euclidean space)

$$-4L_8 B_0^2 \text{tr} \left(\mathcal{M}^\dagger U \mathcal{M}^\dagger U + U^\dagger \mathcal{M} U^\dagger \mathcal{M} \right). \quad (177)$$

For $U = \mathbf{I}$ the above operator reduces to

$$-16L_8 B_0^2 \left(\bar{S}^2 - (\bar{P}^a)^2 \right) \quad (178)$$

In the ECQM, after imposing the condition (167) the only origin of this term is the exchange of heavy meson states. This leads precisely to the sum rule (6) displayed in section 2. When combining it with the solution (168) of the CSR constraints (165), (166) and the definition (172) for Z_π one finds the remarkable relation

$$L_8 = \frac{1}{64B_0^2} \left(\frac{Z_\sigma}{m_\sigma^2} - \frac{Z_\Pi}{m_\Pi^2} \right) = \frac{F_0^2}{16} \left(\frac{1}{m_\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{m_\Pi^2} \right) \left(1 - \frac{\Delta_{SP}}{Z_\pi(m_\sigma^2 + m_\Pi^2)} \right), \quad (179)$$

which represents one of the predictions of the ECQM and modifies substantially the estimates of [25]. The term proportional to Δ_{SP} is very small and, in practice, negligible

$$\frac{\Delta_{SP}}{Z_\pi(m_\sigma^2 + m_\Pi^2)} \simeq \frac{6F_0^2}{m_\sigma^2 + m_\Pi^2} < 0.03. \quad (180)$$

Thus one expects that

$$L_8 > \frac{F_0^2}{8m_\Pi^2}. \quad (181)$$

This is a consequence of the CSR inequality (166), $m_\sigma^2 < m_\Pi^2$, and the smallness of Δ_{SP} .

We finally turn to the chiral constant L_5 , which goes with the operator

$$2 B_0 \text{tr} \left((D_\mu U)^\dagger D_\mu U (\mathcal{M}^\dagger U + U^\dagger \mathcal{M}) \right). \quad (182)$$

First of all, a contribution to this low energy constant seems to come from the operator proportional to the coefficient $\left(c_2 + \frac{N_c \delta f_0}{2g_{S0}} \right)$ in the lagrangian (139). For $U = \mathbf{I}$ this operator reduces to the term

$$\text{tr} \left(\bar{S} \bar{A}_\mu \bar{A}_\mu \right), \quad (183)$$

which jeopardizes the correct chiral high energy behavior of the following three-point correlator

$$\Pi_{SAA} = \int d^4x d^4y \exp(ipx + i qy) \langle T (\bar{q}q(0) \bar{q} \gamma_5 \gamma_\mu q(x) \bar{q} \gamma_5 \gamma_\mu q(y)) \rangle. \quad (184)$$

For large values of momenta one expects from the asymptotic freedom of QCD that perturbation theory describes the leading asymptotics. But in perturbation theory it is evident that the correlator (184) identically vanishes in the chiral limit as any Feynman diagrams necessarily contain an odd number of γ matrices. It is a consequence of the chiral invariance under the transformation

$$q(x) \rightarrow \gamma_5 q(x), \quad \bar{q}(x) \rightarrow -\bar{q}(x) \gamma_5, \quad \bar{S}(x), \bar{P}(x) \rightarrow -\bar{S}(x), -\bar{P}(x), \quad (185)$$

which in the chiral limit holds for the generating functional of perturbative QCD.

Therefore the correlator (184) should vanish at large momenta and cannot have a constant asymptotic behaviour such as the one provided by the contact term (183) in the generating functional. We assume this behavior to hold at scale Λ for the correlators of the ECQM and impose one more CSR constraint

$$c_2 + \frac{N_c \delta f_0}{2g_{S0}} = 0. \quad (186)$$

Consequently, the constant L_5 is induced solely by $\tilde{\sigma}$ exchange, both from the terms in (139) and from the piece linear in $\tilde{\sigma}$ in (94)

$$-\frac{1}{2} N_c g_A^2 \Sigma_0 I_0 \tilde{\sigma} \text{tr}(l_\mu l_\mu). \quad (187)$$

By coupling an external axial source and repeating the analysis done in the massless case, we determine the shift in the pion decay constant

$$F_\pi^2 = F_0^2 \left(1 + m_\pi^2 \frac{\Delta}{B_0 \Sigma_0} \left(1 - \frac{f_0^2}{F_0^2} + \frac{2N_c \Sigma_0 \delta f_0}{F_0^2 g_{S0}} \right) \right) + O(m_\pi^4), \quad (188)$$

in the notations of (147). This implies

$$L_5 = \frac{\Delta}{8B_0 \Sigma_0} (F_0^2 - f_0^2 + \frac{2N_c \Sigma_0 \delta f_0}{g_{S0}}). \quad (189)$$

Notice the appearance of δf_0 in these formulae. As we announced, this effective constant is relevant in the $m_q \neq 0$ case. This is a nuisance because it introduces a further unknown parameter into the problem. However, it is clear from (119) that $F_0^2 - f_0^2$ is logarithmically enhanced, something which is not expected to happen for δf_0 . In the large log approximation it is thus justified to neglect δf_0 in front of the other quantities and we will do so.

Notice also that (182) is linear in m_q and the sign of L_5 is correlated with that of Δ and Σ_0 . Indeed, for any value of $\bar{g}_S$, the product $\bar{g}_S x$ is positive, while the sign of Δ is always the same as the one of x . Thus the sign of L_5 is finally that of M_0 and we conclude that M_0 must be positive, just like m_q . Had we chosen the opposite sign for m_q the sign of M_0 would have came out reversed as well.

8. Fit and discussion

Let us enumerate all the parameters of the ECQM. The first seven parameters are not directly observable: M_0 , x (instead of Σ_0), δ (instead of f_0), $\bar{g}_S$, γ (instead of g_P),

I_0 (instead of Λ), ϵ . Three other parameters are directly taken from phenomenology: $g_A \simeq 0.8$ [26], $\hat{m}_q(1\text{GeV}) \simeq 7$ MeV and $B_0 \simeq 1.4$ GeV [13, 27] (B_0 instead of c_1). The two last ones provide the pion mass $m_\pi \simeq \sqrt{2m_q B_0} \simeq 140$ MeV. One more parameter, Δ_{SP} is related to the four-quark condensate which can be estimated as in (161) by employing the vacuum dominance hypothesis. However this parameter makes almost no influence on the main meson characteristics (as it follows from (173), (179) the deviation is of order 2%). Therefore we neglect it in the forthcoming fit.

The above 7 unknown parameters are involved in the determination of 7 physical quantities: $m_\sigma, m_\Pi, F_0, F_\Pi, F_\sigma, L_5, L_8$, but they are connected by 3 relations; namely, the mass-gap equation (110) and the two CSR constraints (174) and (173). Thus the set of physical entries is sufficient in principle to find all the ECQM constants from phenomenology and make some non-trivial predictions. In a way this is a little miracle since we started with $\mathcal{O}(50)$ operators, each one with an unknown constant. In addition our model reproduces the same value for the chiral constants L_1, L_2, L_3, L_9 and L_{10} as the simplest chiral quark model[2] in what concerns the radiatively induced quark contribution. These cannot be directly read from (94) because we have retained there only the logarithmically enhanced terms. It is known, however, that the pieces in the effective action leading to the above L_i 's, albeit not logarithmically enhanced, are universal and independent of the regulator. Of course the direct bare contribution to the L_i 's is not included in our approach (see appendix C).

Let us perform a tentative fit using the phenomenological values for the heavy pion mass $m_\Pi \simeq 1.3$ GeV [12] and for $F_0 \simeq 90$ MeV [13]. First we relate the scalar meson mass to the chiral constant L_8 by means of (179)

$$m_\sigma^2 = m_\Pi^2 \left(\frac{16L_8 m_\Pi^2}{F_0^2} - 1 \right)^{-1}. \quad (190)$$

When taking the above input for m_Π, F_0 and the phenomenological value of $L_8 = (0.9 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-3}$ [13] one obtains the mean value for the σ meson mass $m_\sigma \simeq 0.9$ GeV which is well compatible with the experimental data [12]. The central value corresponds to $|\beta| \simeq 0.7$.

Next let us use the definition of the pion decay constant (119) in order to eliminate the parameter I_0

$$\sqrt{N_c I_0} = \frac{F_0 \sqrt{1 - \delta^2}}{g_A |x| M_0}. \quad (191)$$

After substituting in (171) one obtains

$$|\beta| = \frac{B_0 g_A \bar{g}_S x}{\sqrt{1 - \delta^2} M_0}. \quad (192)$$

This relation can be combined with the definition of the chiral constant L_5 (189) and with eq.(123) for the scalar meson mass reexpressed in terms of $x, M_0, \bar{g}_S$

$$L_5 = \frac{F_0^2 (1 - \delta^2)}{8B_0 M_0 (3 - 2x)}, \quad m_\sigma^2 = 2M_0^2 \frac{3 - 2x}{\bar{g}_S x}. \quad (193)$$

Evidently there are two combinations of eqs.(192), (193) which do not depend on M_0

$$\sqrt{1 - \delta^2} = \frac{4L_5|\beta|m_\sigma^2}{g_A F_0^2} = \frac{4L_5 m_\Pi^2 |\beta|(1 - \beta^2)}{g_A F_0^2}, \quad (194)$$

$$\rho \equiv \bar{g}_S x(3 - 2x) = \frac{8L_5^2 m_\Pi^6 \beta^4 (1 - \beta^2)^3}{g_A^4 F_0^4 B_0^2}. \quad (195)$$

The product $\bar{g}_S x$ is positive for solutions delivering a true minimum of the effective potential both in the subcritical and overcritical regimes (see the discussion in section 4). Hence $x < 3/2$. For the central value of $L_5 = (2.2 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-3}$ [28] one gets

$$\delta \simeq 0.56, \quad \rho \simeq 0.12. \quad (196)$$

We now eliminate $\bar{g}_S$ from the mass-gap eq.(110) in favour of ρ

$$(2 - \rho)x^2 - 5x + 3 = 0, \quad (197)$$

finding

$$x_\pm = \frac{5 \pm \sqrt{1 + 12\rho}}{4 - 2\rho}. \quad (198)$$

Clearly if $\rho < 2$ then both solutions are positive but only the second one, $x_- < 1$, delivers a true minimum. It corresponds to the subcritical regime with the positive $\bar{g}_S$. The first solution $x_+ > 3/2$ does not correspond to an absolute minimum. In the QCD case we have estimated that $\rho \simeq 0.12$ and therefore the ECQM effective action motivated by QCD is realized in the subcritical domain. This is one of our main conclusions:

$$x \simeq 0.92, \quad \bar{g}_S \simeq 0.11 > 0, \quad \beta > 0. \quad (199)$$

Of course the fact that $\bar{g}_S \ll 1$ does not by itself imply that the coupling constant associated to the NJL-type operators is therefore relatively weak as $\bar{g}_S$ is subject to an arbitrary normalization. However, we have already argued when discussing the gap equation that the normalization used here is the natural one. Indeed that the theory is in a weak coupling regime can be seen in that Σ_0 is close to M_0 .

Using eq. (192) one finds the central values for the bare constituent mass, $M_0 \simeq 190$ MeV (i.e. $\Sigma_0 \simeq 180$ MeV) and consequently $I_0 \simeq 0.1$; that is $\Lambda \sim 1.4$ GeV, in very good agreement with the naive estimate from ChPT, $\Lambda \simeq 1.2$ GeV. For the above values of B_0, x, M_0, I_0 one finds from (152) that $c_1 \simeq -(185 \text{ MeV})^3$.

Using the relation for the heavy pion mass (123) we can estimate the asymmetry between scalar and pseudoscalar four-fermion interaction

$$\gamma = \bar{g}_S \left(\frac{m_\Pi^2 \delta^2}{2M_0^2} - x^2 \right) \simeq 0.7. \quad (200)$$

Thereby the pseudoscalar four-quark coupling, $\bar{g}_P \simeq 0.16$ has a tendency to be stronger than the scalar one. However the pretty large errors in the determination of the phenomenological coupling constants L_5, L_8 makes this conclusion somewhat qualitative.

Finally we apply eq.(174) to fix the parameter ϵ . According to (174) it may have two values: $\epsilon \simeq -0.14$ or $\epsilon \simeq -0.7$. The former one is close to zero, compatible with a hidden left-right symmetry of the ECQM action ⁹, whereas the latter one is quite

⁹The exact symmetry is realized for a scalar meson with a mass ~ 650 MeV

compatible (within the error bar) with the possibility to have only one type of the mass term, $\epsilon = \pm 0.5$.

After substitution into the definition (157) of the weak decay constant of the heavy pion F_Π one arrives at the prediction

$$\begin{aligned} d_1 = \frac{F_\Pi m_\Pi^2}{F_0 m_\pi^2} &= \frac{\sqrt{1-\delta^2}}{\delta} \left(\frac{2\epsilon\gamma M_0}{\bar{g}_S x g_A B_0} + 1 \right) \\ &= \pm \frac{\sqrt{1-\beta^2}}{\beta} \simeq \pm 1.0 \end{aligned} \quad (201)$$

The constant F_Π is not yet measured experimentally but has been estimated recently using modified sum rules [28] to correspond to $|d_1| = 2.2 \pm 0.8$. Finally, we estimate the scalar meson decay constant $F_\sigma \simeq 1.4F_\pi$, which quantifies the deviations from the predictions of the linear sigma model.

By now we have derived the following three predictions: m_σ (for a given value of L_8 , or the other way round), F_Π and F_σ . We have so far considered the central values. Let us now examine the error bars. A conservative estimate $400\text{MeV} < m_\sigma < 1200\text{MeV}$ is given in [11]. From (179) it leads to $0.7 \times 10^{-3} < L_8 < 3.5 \times 10^{-3}$, to be confronted with the chiral dynamics estimate $L_8 = (0.9 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-3}$. We see that too light values of m_σ are ruled out from pion and kaon physics since the allowed range for L_8 leads to $700\text{MeV} < m_\sigma < 1200\text{MeV}$. Conversely, one sees from (179) that $L_8 \geq 0.6 \times 10^{-3}$. Then, assuming compatibility of these phenomenological data, we derive

$$L_8 = (1.0 \pm 0.3) \times 10^{-3}, \quad 700\text{MeV} < m_\sigma < 1200\text{MeV}. \quad (202)$$

For these ranges we find from (201) and (176)

$$|d_1| = 0.6 - 2.5, \quad F_\Pi = (0.4 - 1.8) \times 10^{-2} F_\pi, \quad F_\sigma = (1.2 - 2.6) F_\pi. \quad (203)$$

These quantities have not yet been measured. It is worth pointing out that they are sensitive to the sigma meson mass and therefore constitute a good laboratory for improving our knowledge of the scalar channel.

We have seen that all parameters of the ECQM can be derived from meson phenomenology at low and intermediate energies and that this model is predictive. It is quite remarkable that the values we obtain for the different coefficients and constants of the effective action are in excellent agreement with our theoretical expectations. For instance, f_0 is smaller but of the same order as F_0 ; the coupling constant g_{P1} is slightly bigger, but again of the same order as g_{S0} , as some theoretical considerations suggest (see appendix B). The chiral symmetry breaking scale Λ comes out naturally in the expected range, while one of the allowed values of the parameter ϵ is compatible with the left-right symmetry discussed in the text.

9. Conclusions

Let us summarize the key points of our approach, outline the main results and explore possible continuations of our work

1) We have seen that the original chiral quark model is not sufficient to describe meson physics in the GeV energy region. The structural constants L_5, L_8 of the effective chiral lagrangian also require four-quark interaction operators to be adequately accounted for. Moreover it can be shown (see appendix B) that a consistent QCD bosonization, with the help of bosonic chiral fields incorporated into the constituent mass operator, generically induce four-quark interaction of the NJL type. Thus the most notable features of the ECQM derive quite naturally from QCD.

2) We have proposed a very general approach based on the wilsonian ideas of retaining only the light degrees of freedom and using symmetry and dimensional considerations. Thus, the ECQM should not be regarded as ‘just another model’ for low energy QCD, but rather as a genuine and correct parametrization of QCD below the CSB scale Λ in the scalar and pseudoscalar channels, much in the same way as the chiral lagrangian is not a model of QCD below the meson threshold, but QCD itself.

3) Two novel ingredients, namely the matching to QCD, via the chiral symmetry restoration at high energies, and the renormalization group analysis play a crucial role in eliminating some of the unknown parameters and setting the accuracy of our approach.

4) We have made some approximations such as neglecting quark operators of canonical dimension $d > 6$ and purely chiral operators with four derivatives of chiral dimension $d \geq 4$, the large- N_c approach and the large-log approximation. These systematic approximations have obviously some bearing on the accuracy of the present approach to the ECQM, but it is hard to go beyond them without more precise knowledge of the value of the bare couplings at the scale Λ , something which is at present impossible without solving QCD (perhaps by performing numerical simulations in the ECQM and matching them with QCD[30]). At any rate we do not really expect the uncertainty of the present approach to be worse, at comparable energies, than the one characteristic of ChPT.

5) The approximations we have made in our action are theoretically self-consistent to ensure renormalizability of the low-energy action. It is remarkable that the number of parameters which have been retained happens to be sufficient to fit well the phenomenology of π, η and σ mesons and this with quite natural values as dictated by dimensional and symmetry considerations. The model allows to reliably estimate the scalar meson masses and decay constants from other data. They come out naturally in a range which is not in obvious conflict with low energy phenomenology, something that does not happen in the NJL model.

6) Our analysis shows that the incorporation of the chiral constituent mass M_0 , as in the conventional CQM, leads to a relatively small value for the coupling constant of the effective NJL-like four fermion interactions, which come out to be relatively weak.

7) It is remarkable that the scalar and pseudoscalar fermion self-interaction do not appear to be equal. This is because chiral symmetry is realized in low energy QCD in a rather subtle and not totally manifest way at the level of the effective action. It is worth pointing out also that the structure of soft breaking mass terms is compatible with the one corresponding to the $L \leftrightarrow R$ symmetry in eq. (136).

8) The generalization to three light quarks is in progress. One adds then two more 4-fermion operators to the list (65) - (68), but gains the physics of the scalar and pseudoscalar $SU(3)$ -octet mesons.

9) In this spirit we propose the pseudoscalar singlet state to be the natural heavy partner of the σ meson. Thereby the resolution of the $U_A(1)$ problem and the η' meson mass will be implemented in the ECQM by means of 4-quark flavour-singlet pseudoscalar forces. Obviously one should go away from the large N_c limit to study this extension.

10) The generalization to include scalar isotriplet or spin ≥ 1 quark currents is quite straightforward. The effects of such resonances can be partially absorbed in the structural constants of the ECQM, for instance, in δg_A . Hence their incorporation will modify also the latter ones (a related discussion in the case of extended NJL model can be found in [5, 26]).

Acknowledgements

This work is supported by grants CICYT AEN95-0590 and CIRIT 1996SGR00066. A.A. is supported by the Spanish Ministerio de Educación y Cultura (Ref. SAB1995-0439) and partially by grants RFFI 98-02-18137, INTAS-93-283-ext and GRACENAS 6-19-97. We are grateful to J.Soto for useful discussions and comments. D.E. wishes also to thank E. Aguirre for inspiring comments.

Appendix A

Let us justify here the use of the EOM (11) and (23) to eliminate certain higher-dimensional vertices in section 3. For simplicity we do not introduce external sources. The simpler case concerns the EOM of quark fields (23) as they are linear. The CQM leads to the generalized Dirac operator

$$i\hat{D}_{CQM} = i \not{\partial} - M_0(U^+ P_R + U P_L), \quad (A1)$$

acting on quark fields $q(x)$. Since we eventually integrate out the quark fields, we need to use the field equation $\hat{D}_{CQM}q(x) = 0$ inside the fermion loop to eliminate the unwanted operators. We shall treat all the operators with dimension ≥ 4 as perturbations and thus consider the v.e.v. of products of them, performing the appropriate Wick contractions. The CQM Dirac derivative will thus act on the fermion propagator

$$\underline{q(x)\bar{q}(y)} \equiv \langle T(q(x)\bar{q}(y)) \rangle = \langle x | \frac{1}{\hat{D}_{CQM}} | y \rangle. \quad (A2)$$

giving

$$\hat{D}_{CQM} \underline{q(x)\bar{q}(y)} = \delta^{(4)}(x - y) \mathbf{I}. \quad (A3)$$

The Dirac derivative $\not{\partial}$ appears in operators of $d \geq 5$ like (15),(26),(27),(43),(44) etc. The general structure is

$$\int d^4x \bar{q}(x) O_n \not{\partial} q(x) \quad \text{or} \quad \int d^4x \bar{q}(x) \not{\partial} O_n q(x), \quad (A4)$$

where O_n is a differential operator of finite order and dimension $n \geq 1$ which contains also the relevant matrix structure, in particular, left or right projectors if necessary. Thus one gets, for instance,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int d^4x \int d^4y \bar{q}(x) O_n \not{\partial} \underline{q(x)\bar{q}(y)} O_m q(y) = \\ & - \int d^4x \int d^4y \bar{q}(x) O_n M_0(U^+ P_R + U P_L) \underline{q(x)\bar{q}(y)} O_m q(y) + \int d^4x \bar{q}(x) O_n O_m q(x) \end{aligned} \quad (A5)$$

The last operator in (A5) has dimensionality $d = n + m + 3 \geq 5$. Thus the application of the EOM generates operators of at least the same dimension without the Dirac derivative (or, in general, with one Dirac derivative less). The result of the application of the EOM is the removal of all Dirac derivatives acting on quark fields at the expense of modifying the coupling constants in operators of $d \geq 5$ without derivatives. In particular, the $d = 5$ operators are mapped into a set of $d \geq 5$ operators, the $d = 6$ vertices are mapped into a set of $d \geq 6$ operators, etc.

One can improve this reduction when dealing with the ECQM effective action (74). Indeed, the latter one includes all vertices of $d \leq 4$ and therefore the higher dimensional operators start now from $d = 5$. It corresponds to $m \geq 2$ in (A5). Thus in the ECQM, with the help of the EOM, the $d = 5$ vertices are mapped onto a set of $d \geq 6$ vertices etc.

In an analogous way one can show that the use of the EOM for chiral fields (11) leads also to the modification of coupling constants in higher dimensional vertices

without an insertion of the operator $\partial_\mu l^\mu$. The proof is now complicated by the nonlinear structure of the EOM. Nevertheless one can expand the chiral variables U in powers of π and analyze the pertinent EOM reduction in ChPT. The ChPT counting rules assign dimension zero to the pion field, and $\partial_\mu l^\mu \sim \partial^2 \pi$ thus carries chiral dimension $d = 2$. The equations of motion can clearly be applied to external pion fields without further ado. As for those operators contributing to internal pion loops they will give rise, after the appropriate contractions, to the pion propagator

$$\langle T(\pi(x)\pi(y)) \rangle = \langle x | \frac{1}{\partial^2} | y \rangle. \quad (A6)$$

The application of the Klein-Gordon operator ∂^2 arising from the EOM to the above Green function gives

$$\partial^2 \langle T(\pi(x)\pi(y)) \rangle = \delta^{(4)}(x - y) \mathbf{I}. \quad (A7)$$

Since all operators of $d \leq 3$ are included in the effective lagrangian of the CQM the set of higher dimensional operators treated as perturbations consists of those ones with $d \geq 4$. Hence after the EOM reduction in two vertices connected by one pion propagator one expects that additional local vertices of $d \geq 4 + 4 - 2 = 6$ are induced similarly to (A3). Evidently these $d = 6$ operators have also chiral invariant structures and therefore represent particular combinations of the complete set of $d = 6$ operators classified in section 3. If some of them still contain insertions of the operators $\partial_\mu l^\mu$ and/or $\not{\partial}$ acting directly on quark fields, repeated use of the EOM produces additional operators of $d \geq 6$ without any such insertions.

Appendix B

Below the chiral symmetry breaking scale Λ , the (in the chiral limit) massless Goldstone bosons, associated to the local chiral phase of the quarks, appear. To avoid overcounting we must extract the chiral phase from the QCD partition function. This naturally modifies the QCD action. Let us see how and that, in particular, the separation of chiral fields in QCD is in general accompanied with the pertinent four-quark interaction. We separate the local chiral phase by exploiting the following functional identity (for a related approach see [31])

$$1 = \Delta \int \mathcal{D}U \prod_x \delta \left(\bar{q}_R U q_L(x) + \bar{q}_L U^\dagger q_R(x) \right), \quad (B1)$$

where U are $SU(2)$ fields and Δ is the required Faddeev-Popov determinant.

Now we proceed to calculate the determinant and use the conventional mapping of chiral $SU(2)$ fields onto S^3

$$U = n^0 \mathbf{I} + i \tau^a n^a, \quad a = 1, 2, 3 \quad (n_k)^2 \equiv (n^0)^2 + n^a n^a = 1, \quad (B2)$$

with the notation $k = 0, 1, 2, 3$. Then the properly normalized integral over chiral fields is evaluated as follows

$$\int \mathcal{D}U \prod_x \delta \left(\bar{q}_R U q_L(x) + \bar{q}_L U^\dagger q_R(x) \right) = \int \prod_x \frac{d^4 n(x)}{C} \delta((n_k(x))^2 - 1) \delta(\mathbf{J}_k(x) n_k(x))$$

$$= \prod_x (\mathbf{J}_k(x) \mathbf{J}_k(x))^{-1/2}, \quad (B3)$$

where C is a normalization constant and the quark currents are

$$\mathbf{J}_0(x) \equiv \bar{q}q(x); \quad \mathbf{J}_a(x) \equiv i\bar{q}\gamma_5\tau^a q(x). \quad (B4)$$

Therefore the determinant supporting the identity (B1) reads

$$\Delta = \prod_x \left((\bar{q}q(x))^2 - (\bar{q}\gamma_5\tau^a q(x))^2 \right)^{1/2}. \quad (B5)$$

This four-quark operator can be exponentiated with the help of auxiliary fields. The δ function in (B1) can be exponentiated as well by using the functional Fourier representation. All together allows us to write

$$1 = \int \mathcal{D}U \mathcal{D}\mu \mathcal{D}\phi \mathcal{D}\bar{c} \mathcal{D}c \exp \int d^4x (i\mu(x)(\bar{q}_R U q_L(x) + \bar{q}_L U^\dagger q_R(x)) - (\phi^2(x) + \bar{c}c(x))((\bar{q}q(x))^2 - (\bar{q}\gamma_5\tau^a q(x))^2)), \quad (B6)$$

where $U(x)$, $\mu(x)$, $\phi(x)$ are bosonic fields and $\bar{c}(x)$, $c(x)$ are scalar fermionic ones (ghost fields).

After insertion of this identity in the QCD generating functional one can argue that the quantum average over the gluon vacuum should generically induce (since they are not protected by any symmetry) non-zero v.e.v. for the auxiliary fields $\langle\mu\rangle \equiv M_0$ and $\langle\phi^2(x) + \bar{c}c(x)\rangle \equiv g/4N_c\Lambda^2$. Should all the above v.e.v. be equal to zero we would conclude that the chiral symmetry is not broken and the U field would entirely decouple. Although we cannot at present demonstrate the actual mechanism, we know that this is not the case in low energy QCD and from that point on the analysis presented in this paper takes over.

Appendix C

Here we shall compare our results with those obtained in the pure CQM after inclusion of gluonic corrections and see how they fit together. In [2] the values for F_0 and the low energy chiral constants L_i were derived considering both the contribution which is radiatively induced by the fermion loop with constituent mass M_0 and additional gluon contributions expressed in terms of v.e.v. of gauge invariant gluon condensates. The leading gauge invariant operator is naturally $\langle\alpha_s GG\rangle$ and this was the only one explicitly considered in [2].

As discussed in the text, the chiral constants L_1 , L_2 , L_3 , L_9 and L_{10} , which in the CQM get a contribution from the constituent quark loop

$$8L_1 = 4L_2 = -2L_3 = L_9 = -2L_{10} = \frac{N_c}{48\pi^2}, \quad (C1)$$

are exactly reproduced by the ECQM. The gluonic corrections obtained in [2] would correspond to what in this paper we call bare contributions (and which we have explicitly considered here only for F_0). For the present discussion we take $g_A = 1$, just as the authors of [2] did. We have obtained the following expression for F_0

$$F_0^2 = N_c M_0^2 I_0 + f_0^2. \quad (C2)$$

With the same notations the following result was obtained in [2]

$$F_0^2 = N_c M_0^2 I_0 + \frac{1}{24\pi M_0^2} \langle \alpha_s GG \rangle, \quad (C3)$$

and the identification of f_0 is obvious. Notice that the scale μ which was undetermined in [2] is to be identified with the CSB one Λ . We know this because we have good control on the renormalization group behaviour in the low energy effective theory. We see clearly that the bare coefficients contain all the gluonic contributions which accumulate all gluonic modes both above and below Λ which cannot be expressed in terms of the constituent mass M_0 .

As to the chiral constants L_5 and L_8 , using the large log approximation, we read from [2]

$$L_5 = \frac{N_c M_0}{8B_0} I_0, \quad (C4)$$

and

$$L_8 = \frac{N_c M_0}{16B_0} I_0, \quad (C5)$$

both of which can be made to agree with our results in the $g_{S0} = g_{P1} = 0$ limit for $\delta f_0 = 0$. This limit is quite straightforward to take in L_5 (see (189)), but it is worth recalling that in the present approach L_5 is generated through σ exchange and then the corresponding amplitude has the correct high energy limit. The situation for L_8 is a bit more subtle. The limit in (179) cannot be taken naively in the final expression for L_8 which vanishes, but rather we must replace Z_σ and Z_Π by their expressions in the first term in (179) and then expand in powers of $g_{S0} = g_{P1}$. We then recover (C5). The reason for this subtlety must be eventually traced back to the CSR constraints. On the other hand, in [2], and also using the leading log approximation, one gets

$$C_q = N_c M_0^3 I_0 \quad (C6)$$

This shows that within this approximation M_0 , and consequently L_5 , must be negative, in contradiction with experiment. In [2] this difficulty is circumvented due to the presence of (unfortunately non-universal) finite parts which contribute to L_5 with the opposite sign and eventually allow getting around this sign problem, although the final fit for L_5 , L_8 is not brilliant. We have seen in the main text how in the ECQM the renormalization group implies, on the one hand, the presence of some logarithmically enhanced contact terms which make possible for C_q and L_5 to have opposite signs without having to appeal to finite non-universal constants.

References

- [1] H. Georgi and A. Manohar, Nucl. Phys. B 234 (1984) 189;
H. Georgi, Weak Interactions and Modern Particle Theory (Benjamin/Cummings, Menlo Park, 1984).
- [2] D. Espriu, E. de Rafael and Taron, Nucl. Phys. B345 (1990) 22.
- [3] D. Dyakonov and V. Petrov, Nucl. Phys. B 272 (1986) 457.
- [4] Y. Nambu and G. Jona-Lasinio, Phys. Rev. 122 (1961) 345;
T. Eguchi, Phys. Rev. D 14 (1976) 2755;
M.K. Volkov, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) 157 (1984) 282;
T. Hatsuda and T. Kunihiro, Phys. Lett. B145 (1984) 7;
A. Dhar, R. Shankar and S. R. Wadia, Phys. Rev. D 3 (1985) 3256;
D. Ebert and H. Reinhard, Nucl. Phys. B 271 (1986) 188;
V. Bernard, R. L. Jaffe and U.-G. Meissner, Nucl. Phys. B 308 (1988) 753;
M. Wakamatsu, W. Weise, Z. Phys. A 331 (1988) 173.
- [5] J. Bijnens, C. Bruno and E. de Rafael, Nucl. Phys. B 390 (1993) 501;
D. Ebert, A. A. Bel'kov, A. V. Lanyov and A. Schaale, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 8 (1993) 1313.
- [6] A. A. Andrianov and V. A. Andrianov, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 8 (1993) 1981;
Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. 39 B,C (1995) 257;
A. A. Andrianov, V. A. Andrianov and V. L. Yudichev, Theor. Math. Phys. 108 (1996) 276 .
- [7] M. K. Volkov and C. Weiss, Phys. Rev. D 56 (1997) 221; M. K. Volkov, D. Ebert and M. Nagy, Preprint hep-ph/9705334 (1997).
- [8] J. Bijnens, E. de Rafael and H. Zheng, Z. Phys. C 62 (1994) 437;
J. Bijnens, Phys. Rept. 265 (1996) 369.
- [9] S. Klevansky, Rev. Mod. Phys. 64 (1992) 649.
- [10] E. Pallante and R. Petronzio, Z. Phys. C 65 (1995) 487.
- [11] A. A. Andrianov, Phys. Lett. B157 (1985) 425;
A. A. Andrianov, V. A. Andrianov, V. Yu. Novozhilov and Yu. V. Novozhilov, Lett. Math. Phys. 11 (1986) 217; Theor. Math. Phys. 70 (1987); Phys. Lett. B186 (1987) 401.
- [12] Particle Data Group: R. M. Barnett et al., Phys. Rev. D 54 (1996) 1.
- [13] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, Nucl. Phys. B 250 (1985) 465
- [14] J. Bijnens, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 8 (1993) 3045;
H.W.Fearing and S.Scherer, Phys. Rev. D 53 (1996) 315;
J.Bijnens et al., Preprint hep-ph/9707291 (1997).

- [15] G. t'Hooft, Nucl. Phys. B 72 (1974) 461;
E.Witten, Nucl. Phys. B 160 (1979) 57.
- [16] R. D. Ball, Phys. Rep. 182 (1989) 1 .
- [17] C. Dominguez, Phys. Rev. D16 (1977) 2313; 2320.
- [18] M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainstein and V. I. Zakharov. Nucl. Phys. B 147 (1979) 385, 448.
- [19] L. J. Reinders, H. Rubinstein and S. Yazaki, Phys. Rep. 127 (1985) 1 and references therein.
- [20] M.Jamin and M. Münz, Z. Phys. C66 (1995) 633.
- [21] D. Weingarten, Phys. Rev. Lett. 51 (1983) 1830.
- [22] A. A. Andrianov and V. A. Andrianov. Zap. Nauchn. Semin. LOMI, 245 (1996) 5, preprint hep-ph/9705364.
- [23] J. F. Donoghue and E. Golowich, Phys. Rev. D49 (1994) 1513;
M. Knecht and E. de Rafael, Preprint hep-ph/9712457 (1997).
- [24] B. Moussallam, Nucl. Phys. B504 (1997) 381.
- [25] J. F. Donoghue, C. Ramirez and G. Valencia, Phys. Rev. D39 (1988) 1947;
G.Ecker, J. Gasser, A. Pich and E. de Rafael, Nucl. Phys. B 321 (1989) 311.
- [26] S.Peris, Phys. Lett. B 268 (1991) 415;
S.Peris and E. de Rafael, Phys. Lett. B 309 (1993) 389.
- [27] H. G. Dosch and S.Narison, Phys. Lett. B417 (1998) 173.
- [28] T. Hannah, Phys. Rev. D 57 (1996) 4648.
- [29] V. Elias et al., Phys. Lett. B 412 (1997) 131.
- [30] A. R. Levi, V. Lubicz and C. Rebbi, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Supp.) 53 (1997) 275.
- [31] N. Karchev and A. Slavnov, Teor. Mat. Fiz. 65 (1985) 192.